

Let this be Printed,

WHITEHALL,  
Decemb. 10. 1687.

*Sunderland P.*

Let this be Printed,

WHITEHALL,  
Decemb. 10. 1687.

*Sunderland P.*



REASONS  
FOR  
ABROGATING  
THE  
TEST,  
Imposed upon All  
Members of Parliament

*Anno 1678. Octob. 30.*

In these Words,

I A. B. do solemnly and sincerely, in the Presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, That I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at, or after the Consecration thereof by any Person whatsoever; And that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are Superstitious and Idolatrous.

---

First Written for the Author's own Satisfaction; And now  
Published for the Benefit of all others whom it may concern.

---

LONDON: Printed for *Henry Bonwicke* at the *Red Lyon* in  
*St. Paul's Church-yard*, MDCLXXXVIII.

LEASONS

FOR

ABROGATING

THE

TESTS

OF

THE

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

# REASONS FOR ABROGATING THE TEST.



THE *TEST* imposed upon all Members of Parliament, *October* 30. 1678. ought (I humbly conceive) to be repeal'd for these *Reasons*;

*First*, Because it doth not only diminish, but utterly destroy the natural *Rights* of *Peerage*, and turns the *Birth-right* of the English *Nobility* into a *precarious* Title: So that what was in all former Ages only forfeited by *Treason*, is now at the mercy of every *Faction* or every *Passion* in Parliament. And therefore how useful soever the *Test* might have been in its season, it some

B

time

time must prove a very ill Precedent against the *Rights of Peerage*; for if it may be allow'd in any Case, there is *no* Case in which it may not be *imposed*.

And therefore I remember that in the First *Transubstantiation-Test*, *Anno Dom. 1673*, the *Rights of Peerage* are [indeed according to constant Custom] secur'd by Proviso. *Provided* always, That neither this Act, nor anything therein contained, shall extend, be judg'd, or interpreted any ways to hurt or prejudice the *Peerage* of any *Peer* of this *Realm*, or to take away any right, power, privilege or profit, which any person [being a *Peer* of this *Realm*] hath or ought to enjoy by reason of his *Peerage*, either in time of *Parliament* or otherwise.

And in the Year 1675. when this Test or Oath of *Loyalty* was brought into the House of Peers, That it is not lawful upon any Pretence whatsoever to take up Arms against the King, and by his Authority against his Person, it was vehemently protested against as a Breach of Privilege.

No body could except against the Matter of the Test it self, much less the Nobility, who had generally taken it upon the Account of their several Trusts in the Militia. So that the only Debate was, Whether the very Proposal of it, as a *Qualification* for a *Right* to sit in *Parliament*, were

were not a *Breach* of the *fundamental Right* of *Peerage*? And after some *Debates* upon the *Point* of *Peerage* it was, without ever entering into the *Merits* of the *Cause* it self, thrown out by an *unanimous* *Vote* of the *House*, *April* 21. 1675. Before the putting of the *Question*, this *PROTESTATION* is entred.

"A *Bill* to prevent the *Dangers* which may arise  
"from *Persons* disaffected to the *Government*.

"The *House* resolv'd into a *Committee* to consider of it, and being resum'd, the *Question* was  
"put, Whether this *Bill* does so far intrench  
"upon the *Privileges* of this *House*, as it ought  
"therefore to be cast out? It was at first resolved  
"in the *Negative* with this *Memorandum*, That  
"before the putting the abovesaid *Question*, these  
"Lords following desired *Leave* to enter their  
"Dissents, if the *Question* was carried in the *Negative*, and accordingly did enter their Dissents,  
"as followeth.

"We, whose *Names* are underwritten, being  
"Peers of this *Realm*, do according to our *Rights*,  
"and the ancient *Usage* of *Parliaments*, declare,  
"That the *Question* having been put, Whether the  
"Bill, entituled An *Act* to prevent the *Dangers*  
"which may arise from *Persons* disaffected to  
"the *Government*, does so far entrench upon the  
"Privileges of this *House*, that it ought therefore  
"to be cast out, it being resolved in the *Negative*,

*"We do humbly conceive, That any Bill which im-  
 "poseth an Oath upon the Peers with a Penalty, as  
 "this doth, That upon the refusal of that Oath  
 "they shall be made incapable of sitting and  
 "voting in this House: As it is a thing unpresi-  
 "dented in former Times, so is it in our humble  
 "Opinion the highest Invasion of the Liberties and  
 "Privileges of the Peerage that possibly may be,  
 "and most destructive of the Freedom which they  
 "ought to enjoy as Members of Parliament.*

*"Because the Privilege of Sitting and Voting  
 "in Parliament is an Honour they have by Birth;  
 "and a Right so inherent in 'em, and insepa-  
 "rable from 'em, as that nothing can take it a-  
 "way, but what by the Law of the Land must  
 "withal take away their Lives, and corrupt their  
 "Blood; upon which Ground, We do here enter  
 "our Dissent from that Vote and our Protestation  
 "against it.*

The Names  
 of the pro-  
 testing Peers  
 to the num-  
 ber of 23.  
 are to be  
 seen in the  
 Journal  
 Book.

*Q U Æ R E*, How many of those Noble  
 Lords voted for the Test in 1678. and then,  
 whether if they have preserved their Rights of  
 Peerage, they have preserv'd its Honour too?

But the Debate was kept up many Days,  
 till at last, *April 30. 1675.* it came to this Is-  
 sue.

It was at last resolved, *That no Oath shall  
 by this Bill be imposed; and pass'd into a general  
 Order*



Order by the whole House, *Nemine contradicente*, as followeth.

“ Order’d by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled, That no Oath shall be imposed by any Bill or otherwise, upon the Peers with a Penalty in case of Refusal to lose their Places and Votes in Parliament, or liberty of Debates therein; and that this Order be added to the standing Orders of this House.

Secondly, It ought to be repealed, because of its dishonourable *Birth* and *Original*; it being the First-born of *Oats’s Plot*, and brought forth on purpose to give *Credit* and *Reputation* to the *Perjury*.

Now I should think that when the Villainy of that is so fully laid open to the World, it should not a little concern the Honour of the Nation, but very much concern the *Honour* and *Wisdom* of the House of *Peers*, to deface so great a Monument erected by themselves in honour of so gross an *Imposture*.

It is Shame enough to the present Age to have given any publick Credit to so enormous a Cheat, and the greatest Kindness it can do it self, is to destroy, as much as may be, all the Records of Acts done by the Government to abett it.

What will Posterity judge of the present Nobility, to see such an *unpresidented Law*, not only

only enacted upon so foul an Occasion; but after the Discovery of the Cheat, asserted with Heat and Zeal, though to the *Subversion* of their own *fundamental Rights* and *Privileges*?

Besides, the *Roman Catholick Peers* have suffered severely enough already by their own honourable House's giving Credit to so dull an Imposition: And I think it is the least Compensation that they can in Honour make them, *only to restore* 'em to their natural Rights.

What will foreign Nations and future Ages think of the Injustice and Barbarity of the present Peerage, to suffer *English* Noblemen to be stript of the *greatest Privilege* of their *Birth-right* by so unheard of a Villainy? And when it is in their Power to see their *injur'd Peers* redressed, that they should not only suffer 'em to be so basely robb'd of their Peerage, but should for ever establish and ratify the *Fraud* by Authority and force of Law.

This wou'd be an eternal National Reproach, and such a Blot upon the House of Peers, that no length of Time cou'd wear away; nothing but the Universal Conflagration could destroy.

*Thirdly*, It ought to be repealed, because of the *incompetent Authority* by which the Law was enacted: It is a Law of an *Ecclesiastical* Nature, made without the Authority of the *Church*, contrary



trary to the Practice of the Christian World in all Ages, and indeed to our Saviours own Commission, who settled all Power of Government, and especially the *Legislative* ( which is the highest Act of it ) upon the Officers of his own Kingdom ; so that for any other Order of Men, to assume the Exercise of any such Authority to themselves, is no less than to depose him from his Throne, by *disowning, neglecting, and affronting* his *Commission* to his *Catholic Church*.

This Power of making Decrees concerning Divine Verities, is the very *Foundation* upon which the whole Fabrick of the Christian Church hath hitherto stood, and is to stand to the End of the World. For if it be once taken away, as here it is, there is no *peculiar Government* left to the Church it self, and without *Government* there can be no Society, or *Band of Union* ; and without that, there remains nothing but Confusion : So dangerous a Trespass is it for the *Temporal Powers* to entrench upon this sacred *Prerogative* of the *Holy Catholic Church*.

The *Civil Power* may restrain the Exercise of it, as they shall judge meet for the Ends of *Peace*, and the Interest of the *Common-Wealth*, and punish it too, at their own Discretion, if it shall any way presume to *entrench* upon the *Power of the State*.

But tho' it may prevent or correct *Abuses*, yet  
it

it cannot usurp the Power it self without manifest *Sacrilege* and *Blasphemy*; in short, this is such a daring *Invasion* of our *Saviour's* own *Kingdom*, that nothing more imports Christian Kings and Governours, than to be wary and cautious how they lay Hands upon it.

Neither can it be pleaded this Law was consented to by the *Bishops* ( to their Shame ) in the House of Lords. For First, it being an *Ecclesiastical* Law, it ought to have been antecedently enacted by them, without any *Lay-concurrence*; and when they had first decreed it by their *own proper Authority*, Then, and not before then, was it lawful for the Parliament to take it into their Consideration, and as they judged fit, to abett it with temporal Penalties.

Which Practice ( as I have before mentioned ) was ever most religiously observed by all Christian Kings and Princes, and never before violated, but by Apostates and *Rebel* Parliaments.

But then Secondly, The Bishops sit not in the House of Lords as *Bishops*, but as *Temporal Barons*, and so act not there by virtue of any Power derived from our *Blessed Saviour*, but from the meer *Grace* and *Favour* of the *King*; And if they themselves should pretend to exercise any *Ecclesiastical* Authority in that Place, they would most scandalously betray, and as much as in 'em lyes, destroy the very *Being* of a *Christian Church*,  
and

and profanely *pawn* the *Bishop* to the *Lord*: Besides, that lastly by the *Law* of *England* the *Ecclesiastical Power* is settled in *Convocation*; so that to Enact any thing of that Nature without *their Consent*, is to *betray* the *Rights* of the *Church* of *England* as by *Law* established in particular, as well as of the *Church Catholick* in *General*.

*Fourthly*, It ought to be repealed because of the *uncertainty* and *Falshood* of the Matters contained in the *Declaration* it self; as,

First, That there is *no Transubstantiation* in the *Sacrament* of our *Saviour's Body* and *Blood*.

And Secondly, That the *Invocation* of *Saints* and the *Mother of God* is *Idolatry*: Both which Propositions are by this *Law* to be solemnly and sincerely in the Presence of *God* professed, testified, and declared, which in *Conscience* is the same thing with a *formal Oath*, whatever it is in *Law*.

Now to oblige the whole *Nobility* of a *Nation*, to swear to the *Truth* of such *abstruse* and *uncertain* Propositions, which they neither *do* nor *can*, nor indeed *ought* to understand, and this upon *Penalty* of forfeiting the *Privileges* of their *Birth-right*, is such a monstrous and inhumane Piece of *Barbarity* as could never have enter'd into the *Thoughts* of any *Man*, but the *infamous* *Author* of it, neither into his (as malicious as his

Nature was) but in his fierce Pursuit of Princely Blood; for that was the only Design of all his Actions after the starting of the *Otesian* Villainy ( of which this Test was the first *Sacrament* ) to pursue and hunt down the Heir of the Crown, which all the World knows, and is now satisfied, he fought by numberless Perjuries, tho' by nothing more than this Test, by which he stript his *Royal Highness* of the Guards of his most faithful Friends; and when he was left alone, it was an easy matter to come to his Person, and in him to the *Monarchy*; so that the very next thing that followed immediately upon it, was the *black Bill of Exclusion*: And next to that it was the very Master-piece of little *Achitophel's* Wickedness. But to return to my Argument.

What is meant by *Transubstantiation* is a thing altogether *unknown* and *uncertain*, especially to the Persons chiefly concerned, the *Nobility* and *Gentry* of the Kingdom: It is a Word and a Notion chiefly handled by the *Schoolmen* and *Metaphysicians* Skill, in whose Writings is the least part of a Gentlemans Education, their Learning is more polite and practicable in the civil Affairs of Humane Life, to understand the *Rules of Honour* and the *Laws* of their *Country*, the Practice of *Martial* Discipline, and the Examples of great Men in former Ages, and by them to square their own Actions in their respective Stations, and the like;

like; but for the Wars between *Scotus* and *Thomas Aquinas*, the *Nominalists* and the *Realists*, and the several *Common-wealths* in the *Metaphysical* World, they are not more beyond than they are below their Knowledge, and yet these numberless *Sects* of Disputers do not quarrel and differ more about any one thing, than the Notion of *Transubstantiation*.

How unreasonable a thing then is it, to impose it upon the Nobility and Gentry of a whole Nation under Forfeiture of all their *Share in the Government*, to abjure a thing that is morally impossible for them to *understand*? This seems too bold and profane an Affront to Almighty God, in whose Presence the Protestation is made; and only declares that Men will swear any thing, they know not what, before the great Searcher of Hearts, rather than lose any worldly Interest: And I dare appeal to the Honourable Members of both Houses, if (when they consider seriously with themselves) they have any *distinct Idea* or *Notion* in their minds of the thing they here so solemnly renounce. I fancy if every Man were obliged to give his own account of it, whatever *Transubstantiation* may be, it would certainly be *Babel*.

The two *Fathers* or rather *Mid-wives* of the first *Transubstantiation Test*, in the Year 1673. were the two famous *Burgesses* of *Oxon*, who



brought it forth without so much as consulting their learned *University*. How much the *Gentleman* Burgess understood, I can only guess; but I am very apt to believe, that his Brother, the *Alderman*, (if the Tryal were made) cannot so much as pronounce the word, much less hammer out the Notion. In short, there seems to be but a *prophane Levity* in the whole matter, and a shameless abuse put upon *God* and Religion, to carry on the wicked designs of a Rebel Faction, as the Event hath proved.

But for the true state of this Matter, I find my self obliged to give a brief historical Account of the *Rise* and *Progress* of this *Controversie of Transubstantiation*; which when I have done, the result and summ of the account will be, that there is no one thing in which Christendom more both *agrees* and *disagrees*. All parties consent in the *thing*, and differ in the *manner*.

And here the History will branch it self into Two parts:

I. As the Matter is stated in the Church of *Rome*.

II. As it hath been determined in the *Protestant Churches*.

Where the first part will sub-divide it self into Two other branches.

1<sup>st</sup>. The *Ecclesiastical* account of the thing; that is, the Authoritative Definitions and Determinations

terminations of the Church about it. And,

2ly. The *Scholastical* account, or the various Disputes of the School-men among themselves in their Cells and Cloysters, none of which were ever vouched by the Authority of the Church : And when I have represented the whole matter of Fact, I may safely leave it to the Honour and Wisdom of the Nation to judge, whether of all things in the World *Transubstantiation* be not the unfittest thing in it to set up for a *State TEST*?

In the first place then it is evident to all Men, that are but ordinarily conversant in Ecclesiastical Learning, That the ancient Fathers, from Age to Age asserted the *real* and *substantial* Presence in very high and expressive terms. The Greeks stiled it, Μεταβολή, μεταξύθμις, μετασκευασμός, μεταποίησις, μεταστοιχείωσις.

And the Latins agreeable with the Greeks; *Conversion, Transmutation, Transformation, Transfiguration, Transfekmentation*, and at length, *Transubstantiation* : By all which they expressed nothing more nor less than the *real* and *substantial* Presence in the Eucharist.

But to represent their Assertions at large, would require much too long a Discourse for this short Essay. And therefore I shall only give an account of it from the time that it first became a Controversie.

And

And the first Man that made it a publick Dispute, was *Berengarius*, Archdeacon of *Angers*, in the Eleventh Century, about the Year 1047, who pleaded in his own behalf, the Authority of a learned Man, *Johannes Scotus Eri-gena*, who passed without Censure in the Ninth Century; but, to pass him by, it is certain, that *Berengarius* publicly denyed the Doctrine of the *Real and Substantial Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ; and resolved the whole Mystery into a mere *Type and Figure*; for this he is condemned of Heresie in the Year 1050, in a Council at *Rome*, under *Leo* the Ninth; and in the same Year, in a Synod at *Verfelles*, and another at *Paris*; and afterwards by *Victor* the Second, in the Year 1055. Upon which *Berengarius*, in a Council held at *Tours*, in the same Year, submitted, and solemnly recanted his Opinion.

But soon relapsing, Pope *Nicholas* the Second, summons a Council at *Rome*, of 113 Bishops, in the Year 1059, where *Berengarius* abjures his Opinion in this form, viz. "That he Anathematizes that Opinion, that asserts, That the Bread and Wine, after the Consecration upon the Altar, is only a Sacrament, and not the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that it is not sensibly handled, and broke by the Priest's hands, and so eaten by the Communicants."



*“nicans.* And this declaration he seals with an *Oath* to the *blessed Trinity* upon the *Evangelists*.

But upon the Death of Pope *Nicholas*, or rather of King *Henry* the First of *France*, a vehement Enemy of *Berengarins* his Doctrine, (who therefore had summoned the fore-mentioned several French Councils against him) *Berengarins* returns to his old Principles, and publicly justifies them, in writing, to the World. For which he is censured by several Provincial Councils.

But then *Gregory* the Seventh, succeeding in the Apostolick See, calls a Council at *Rome* in the Year 1078, in which *Berengarins* abjures again, much after the same form with the former abjuration. But Pope *Gregory* (not satisfied with the same general Confession, of the *substantial Presence*, that he had already eluded) in a second Council, held the Year following, he imposes this *Form of Recantation* upon him.

*“I Berengarins believe in my Heart, and confess with my Mouth, That the things upon the Altar, by virtue of Prayer and Consecration, are changed into the true and proper Flesh and Blood of Christ, and are the true Body of Christ, that was born of a Virgin, and sacrificed upon the Cross, for the Salvation of the World, and that sits at the right hand of the Father; and the*  
*“ true*

“ true Blood of Christ that was shed out of his  
 “ side, not only as a sacramental Sign, but in  
 “ propriety of Nature, and reality of Substance.

This is indeed a pretty bold Assertion of the  
*substantial Presence*; but as to the *Modus* of it,  
 it is evident, that he durst not venture to de-  
 fine it, as himself declares in his *Commentaries*  
*upon the Gospels*, where after having recited se-  
 veral Opinions about it, he concludes, “ But  
 “ these several surmises I shall not pursue, it is  
 “ enough that the substance of the Bread and  
 “ Wine are converted into the substance of the  
 “ Body and Blood of Christ; but as to the *Modus*  
 “ of the Conversion, I am not ashamed to confess  
 “ my Ignorance. And so ended this Controver-  
 sie at that time; *Berengarius* ever after living  
 peaceably; and about Eight Years after dying  
 in the Communion of the Church.

But about this time *Aristotle's Philosophy* was  
 brought into Europe, out of Arabia, as it was  
 translated into the Arabick Tongue by *Averroes*,  
*Avicenna* and others, and out of them translated  
 into Latin; for the Greek Language was at  
 that time utterly lost in those Western parts of  
 the Wor'd. This being then a mighty novelty,  
 the School-men, that were the only pretenders to  
 Learning at that time, embraced it with a gree-  
 dy and implicit Faith, supposing it the very  
*Gospel* of all Philosophick Knowledge; and  
 therefore

therefore set themselves to *mix* and *blend* it with the Doctrines of the Christian Schools; and by its Rules and Maxims to Explain all the Articles of the Christian Faith.

Among the rest, he had one very odd Notion, singular to himself, from all the other Philosophers of *Greece*, *viz.* That every *substance* was compounded of *matter* and *form*; and that these two were really *distinct* from one another; and then that the *quantity* of every Body was really distinct from the *substance* of it, and so *distinct* as to be *separable* from it: And lastly, That all other *Qualities*, *Accidents*, and *Predicaments* were founded not in the *Substance*, but in the *Quantity*; and therefore in all change of Affairs ever followed its Fortunes.

Now the Catholick Church having in *all* Ages asserted the *real* and *substantial* Presence; Oh, say they (to shew their deep new Learning) That is to be understood in the *Aristotelian* way, by separating the *Form* of the Bread from the *Matter*; but chiefly by separating the *inward Substance* of Bread, from its *outward Quantity*, and its *retinue of Qualities*.

This was the Rise of *Philosophick* or *Scholastick Transubstantiation*, that the *Quantity* and *Accidents* of the Bread are pared off from all the *Substance*, and shaped and moulded a-new, so as to cover an humane Body: And after this

they run into an infinite Variety of Disputes and Hypotheses among themselves; so that till the Last Age, it hath been the chief entertainment of all pretenders to Philosophy in Christendom.

*Rupertus* Abbot of *Dentsch*, a Village upon the *Rhine*, lying on the other side of the River, against the City of *Cologne*, a Man of great reputation for Learning in that Age, makes out the Philosophy of the Thing, by the Union of the Word, or Divine Nature, that is Omnipresent with the Bread and Wine; and it is that Unity (he says) that makes it one Body with that in Heaven: And withal, that it is as easie for our Saviour to assume, or unite himself to one as the other; and when that is done, they are both one body; because they are both his Body. This was fine and curious, but not *Aristotelian* enough for that Age; in which that Philosophy was set up as the Standard of humane Wisdom, by the *Beaux Esprits*: Among these, *Petrus Abelardus* gain'd a mighty Name and Reputation for his skill in these new found Philosophick Curiosities, tho' otherwise a Man versed (much beyond the Genius of that Age) in Polite Learning; but being of a proud and assuming Nature, he soon drew upon himself the Envy of the less Learned Monks; which cost him a long scene of Troubles, as he hath elegantly described them,

them, in his Book of his own Persecutions.

But among many other singularities to maintain the separation of the *matter* from the *form*, and the *substance* from the *accidents* in the Sacrament of the Altar he is forced to make use of this shift, That upon the Separation of the Substance, the Accidents that cannot subsist of themselves, are supported by the Air.

But then comes *Peter Lombard*, Anno 1140. Lib. 4. dist. 10. Grand Master of the Sentences, and Father of the next race of School-men, who indeed proves the *real* and *substantial* Presence out of the Ancients; particularly *St. Austin* and *St. Ambrose*; but when he comes to explain the *manner* of it, whether it be a *formal* or *material* change; whether the *substance* of the Bread and Wine be reduced into its *first matter*, or into *nothing*, and the like, his conclusion is, *definire non sufficio*: "I presume not to determine; and therefore  
 " *quitting these uncertain things, this I certainly*  
 " *know from Authorities, viz. That the substance*  
 " *of the Bread and Wine, are converted into the*  
 " *substance of the Body and Blood of Christ; but*  
 " *as for the manner of the Conversion, we are not*  
 " *ashamed to confess our Ignorance.* But if you inquire in what *subject* the *Accidents* subsist, he answers problematically (*mibi videtur*) that they *subsist* without any *subject* at all.



But it was agreed in all Schools, That what-ever became of the *Substance* the *Accidents* remained: And that all outward Operations terminated there; and that only *they* were broken and eaten.

But as for the *substance* of the *Bread* and *Wine*, some were for its permanency *with* the Substance of the Body and Blood, some for its *Annihilation*, some for *physical Conversion*. But then these Curiousites were kept in the Schools, where witty Men, for want of more useful Employment entertained and amused themselves, with these fine subtleties of thought: But then they were confined within the Schools and never admitted so much as to ask the Authority of the Church.

In the next Age comes that young and active Pope, *Innocent* the Third, who succeeded to the See, *Anno* 1198. in the Thirty seventh Year of his Age, having been made Cardinal in the Twenty ninth.

In the Eighteenth Year of his Reign he summoned the famous *Fourth*, or great Council of *Lateran*, at which were present above 400 Bishops, Metropolitans and Patriarchs, besides Embassadors from all Princes in Christendom, for recovery of the Holy Land, Extirpation of Heresies, and for Reformation of the Church. In this Council the Word *Transubstantiate* is first used

used in a Decree of the Church, to express the *real or substantial Presence* of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, under the species of Bread and Wine : Where, in the Decree against the Heresie of the *Albigenses*, who denied the *Real Presence*, it is Enacted, “ *That the Body and Blood of Christ, are really contained under the species of Bread and Wine : The Bread being Transubstantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood, by the Power of God.* But though the Council used the word to Express the Mystery, they did not so much as *define its signification*, much less the *nature* of the thing. It was a word that at that time (it seems) was in *fashion*, having been made use of by some of the more Polite Writers of the Age.

Some give the honour of the Invention to *Paschasius Radbertus*, some to *Petrus Blesensis*, and some to others ; but being a word in Vogue among learned Men, the Council made use of it as a Term of Art, instead of the old word, *Transselementation*, that had hitherto kept its possession among both *Greeks* and *Latins*.

It is pity the *Greek* Copy of this Canon is lost, whereas all the *rest* are preserved : For if we had the *Greek* word that answered to the *Latin*, it might have given us some more light into the thing. However, this was all that was defined.

defined by *Innocent* the Third, or by the Council of *Lateran*; for it is much disputed by learned Men, who was the *Author* of those Canons, many contending that they were drawn up after the Council, because they often quote, and appeal to its Decrees.

This is the chief Argument of the Learned and the Loyal *William Barclay*, and others against them. But if these learned Men had considered a little further, and looked back to the Third Council of *Lateran*, they would have found all the Canons cited in *this* extant in *that*: So that only some Canons of the Third Council, are revived and ratified in this Fourth: And after the clearing of this Objection, I can see no other material Exception against them.

But to proceed; this word having gain'd the Authority of so great a Council, and being put into the Decretals of the Church, by *Gregory* the Ninth, in honor of his Unc'e *Innocent* the Third, it soon gained universal usage among the Latins, and was adopted into the Catalogue of *School Terms*; and was there hammer'd into a Thousand *shapes* and *forms*, by those Masters of Subtlety: And upon it *St. Thomas of Aquin* erects a new Kingdom of his own, against the old *Lombardian* Empire; but long he had not Reigned, when *Scotus*, our subtle Country-man, set up against him. And whatever *St. Thomas*  
of



of *Aquin* asserted, for that reason only, he contradicted him; so that they two became the very *Cæsar* and *Pompey* of the Schools, almost all the great Masters of Disputation from that time, fighting under one of their commands; and what intelligible Philosophy both parties vented about the *Substantial* or *Transubstantial Presence*, upon supposition of the real difference between *Matter* and *Form*, *Substance* and *Accidents*, would be both too nice and too tedious to recite; only in general the *Thomists* maintain the *Transmutation* of the Elements; the *Scotists*, the *Annihilation*; and they proceed to abstract so long, till they could not only separate the *Matter* and *Form*, and *Accidents* of the Bread from one another, but the *Paneity* or Bread-iness it self from them all, and founded a new *Utopian* World of *Metaphysick* and *Specifick* Entities and Abstracts.

Thus far I have, as briefly as I can, represented the *Scholastick History* of this Argument; in which the Authority of the Church is not at all concerned; having gone no farther than to assign or appropriate a Word to signify such a thing; but all along declaring the Thing it self to be beyond the compass of a Definition. I know 'tis commonly said, that the Council of *Trent* hath presumed to define the *Modus*; and learned Men (I know not by what fatal over-sight) take

take it up on trust one from another; and the Definition is generally given in these Terms: That,

Transubstantiation is wrought by the *Annihilation* of the *substance* of the Bread and Wine, the *Accidents* remaining: To the which Annihilation succeeds the Body and Blood of Christ, under the Accidents of Bread and Wine.

So the Bishops of *Durham* and *Winchester* represent it; so Mr. *Alix*, and the Writers of his Church, and not only so but contrary to the sence of all other Churches, they confound the *Real Presence* with *Transubstantiation*, as this learned Man hath done through his whole Disputation upon it, using the very words promiscuously (as indeed all the modern Followers of *Calvin* do) and charging the same absurdities upon both, and imputing the first Invention of the *Real Presence* to *Nicolas* the Second, and *Gregory* the Seventh, in their Decrees against *Berengarius*. But I cannot but wonder how so many learned Men should with so much assurance fanſie to themselves such a Definition in the *Trent Council*, of the *Modus* of Transubstantiation, by the *Annihilation* of the *Substance*, and the *Permanency* of the *Accidents*, when the Fathers of that Council were so far from any such Design, That they design'd nothing more carefully, than to avoid all Scholastic Definitions. The subtil Disputes about the

the *Modus existendi* (as they termed it) between the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* in that Council are described at large by Father *Paolo* himself in the Fourth Book of his History. But withal, he says, they were extreamly Displeasing and Offensive to the Fathers, but most of all to the NUN-CIO himself; and therefore it was resolved in a General Congregation to determine the Matter in as few and general Terms as possible, to offend neither Party, and avoid Contentions; and when, notwithstanding this Decree, they fell into new Disputes, they are check'd by the Famous Bishop of *Bitunto*, who was one of the chief Compilers of the Canons, telling them they came thither to condemn Heresies, not to define Scholastick Niceties. And accordingly in the very First Chapter of the 13<sup>th</sup>. Session, in which this Article was defined, when they determined the Real Presence; they at the same time declare the *Existendi Ratio* to be ineffable; and in the 4<sup>th</sup>. Chapter, where *Transubstantiation* is decreed, the Canon runs thus: That,

“By the Consecration of the Bread and Wine,  
“there is a Conversion of the whole Substance  
“of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of  
“Christ, and of the whole Substance of the Wine  
“into the Substance of his Blood, which Conver-  
“sion is fitly and properly called by the Holy Ca-  
“tholick Church; Transubstantiation.

In all which the Council only appropriates the Word *Transubstantiation* to express the *Real Presence*, which it had before determined in the First Chapter, not to be after a *natural* way of Existence, as Christ sits at the right Hand of God, but *Sacramental*, after an *ineffable manner*.

Tho here some peevishly object, the Inconsistence of the Council with it self, when it declares, that the thing is *inexpressible* and yet appropriates a word to *express* it: Whereas all Christendom knows that the *Procession* of the Eternal Word from the Father is Ineffable, and yet is expressed by the Word *Generation*; and that the *Union* of the divine and humane Nature is ineffable, and yet is called the *Hypostatical Union*; and that the *Unity* in the *Trinity* is ineffable, and yet is expressed by the Word *Consubstantial*: So that this Council seems to have defin'd no more than the Council of *Nice* did in the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, in expressing the Unity of the Three Persons by the Word *ὁμοῖα*, and the Distinction, by the Word *ὑπόστασις*, which amounted to no more than this, That as it is certain from the Holy Scriptures that in the Unity of the God-head there is a Trinity, so the Holy Fathers to avoid the Niceties of contentious Men, such as *Arius* was, determine that for the Time to come the  
Mystery

Mystery shall be expressed by the Terms *εἰσωνία* and *ὑπόστασις*; but as for any Philosophical Notion of the Mystery, the Church never presum'd to define it, and this is the *Definition* of the Council of *Trent*, of the *Real Presence*, that there is a *Conversion* of the *Substances* under the *Species* or *Appearances* of *Bread* and *Wine*, which the Church hath thought convenient to express by the Word *Transubstantiation*.

And yet tho the Council approve the Word, yet it does not impose it, it only declares it to be *convenient*, but no where says 'tis *necessary*. And as for the Term *Conversion*, it is much older than the Word *Transubstantiation*, familiarly used by the Ancient Fathers; and so is the Word *Species*: I know indeed it is usual with Schoolmen and Protestant Writers to translate the Words under *Species of Bread and Wine*, by these Words, under the *Accidents of Bread and Wine*, as particularly the late Bishops of *Durham* and *Winchester* have done. But this is to impole Philosophick Niceties upon the Decrees of the Church.

And tho perhaps all the Fathers of the Council believed the Reality of the New substantial Presence under the Old Accidents, yet they had more Temper and Discretion than to Authorise it by conciliar Determination, and therefore use only the Word *Species* ( and no other Word is

used by *Nicolas II*, *Gregory VII*, and *Innocent III*, that are thought the Three great Innovators in the Argument of the *Real Presence*) that properly signifies Appearance, but nothing of Physical or Natural Reality, so that tho the Presence under the Species be *real*, yet as the Council hath defined it, it is not *Natural* but *Sacramental*, which *Sacramental Real Presence* they express by the Word *Transubstantiation*, and recommend the Propriety of the Word to the Acceptance of Christendom.

This is the short History of the *Real Presence* in the Church of *Rome*, where, as far as I can discern, the *thing* it self hath been owned in all Ages of the Church, the *Modus* of it never defined, but in the Schoo's, and tho they have fancied Thousand Definitions to themselves, their *Metaphysicks* were never admitted into the Church. And so I proceed to give an Account of it; as it hath been defin'd in the Protestant Churches, where we shall find much the same *Harmony* of Faith and *Discord* of Philosophy as in the Church of *Rome*.

And first we must begin with the famous *Confession* of *Ausburg*, that was drawn up by *Melancthon*, and in the Year 1530 presented to *Charles the Fifth*, by several Princes of *Germany*, as a Declaration of the Faith of the first Reformers,



mers, and as the only true standard of the Ancient Protestant Religion.

The Confession consists of Two parts.

I. What Doctrines themselves taught.

II. What Abuses they desired to be reformed.

As to the later, the Emperor undertook to procure a General Council.

As to the former, particularly this Article of the *Presence in the Sacrament*, they have published it in two several forms: In the *Latin Edition* it is worded thus: "*Concerning the Lords Supper, we teach, That the Body and Blood of Christ are there present indeed, and are distributed to the Receivers at the Lords Supper; and condemn those that teach otherwise.*" In the *German Edition* it is worded thus: "*Concerning the Lords Supper we teach, That the true Body and Blood of Christ are truly present in the Supper, under the species of Bread and Wine, and are there distributed and received.*" And in an *Apology* written by the *same hand*, and published the Year following, it is thus expressed: "*We believe, That in the Supper of our Lord, the Body and Blood of Christ are really and substantially present, and are Exhibited indeed with those things, that are seen, the Bread and Wine. This belief our Divines constantly maintain, and we find,*"

“ find, not only the Church of Rome hath asserted  
“ the Corporeal Presence, but that the Greek  
“ Church hath anciently, as well as at this time, as-  
“ serted the same; as appears by their Canon Missæ.

The same Author Explains himself more  
at large in his Epistle to *Fredericus Myconius*.  
“ I send you (says he) the passages out of the  
“ Ancients, concerning the Lord's Supper, to prove,  
“ that they held the same with us; namely,  
“ That the Body and Blood of our Lord are there  
“ present indeed. And after divers Citations  
he concludes, “ That seeing this is the express  
“ Doctrine of the Scriptures, and constant Tra-  
“ dition of the Church, I cannot conceive how,  
“ by the name of the Body of Christ, should only be  
“ understood the sign of an absent Body; for though  
“ the Word of God frequently makes use of Meta-  
“ phors, yet there is a great difference to be made  
“ between Historical Relations, and Divine Insti-  
“ tutions. In the first, matters transacted among  
“ Men, and visible to the Sence are related; and  
“ here we are allow'd, and often forced to speak  
“ figuratively: But if in Divine Precepts, or Re-  
“ velations, concerning the Nature or the Will of  
“ God, we should take the same liberty, wise Men  
“ cannot but fore-see the Mischiefs that would un-  
“ avoidably follow. There would be no certainty  
“ of any Article of Faith. And he gives an in-  
stance in the Precept of Circumcision to Abraham:  
That



That upon those Terms the good Patriarch might have argued with himself, That God never intended to impose a thing so seemingly absurd, as the words sound; and that therefore the Precept is to be understood only of a Figurative or Metaphorical Circumcision; the Circumcision of our Lusts. So far this Learned Reformer.

Now the Authority of Melancthon weighs more with us of the Church of England, (as the learned Dr. St. very well observes) that in the settlement of our Reformation, there was no such regard had to Luther or Calvin, as to Erasmus and Melancthon, whose Learning and Moderation were in greater Esteem here, than the fiery spirits of the other; and yet few Writers have asserted the Substantial and Corporeal Presence in higher terms than this moderate Reformer; and though he may sometimes have varied in Forms of Speech, he continued constant and immovable in the substance of the same Doctrine.

For in the Confession of the Saxon Churches (at the Compiling of which he was chief Assistant) drawn up in the Year 1551, to have been presented to the Council of Trent; a true and substantial Presence is asserted, during the time of Ministration. "We teach (say they) That Sacraments are Divine Institutions; and that the things themselves out of the use design'd are no Sacraments;

Conference,  
P. 119.

“ *Sacraments ; but in the use, Christ is verily*  
 “ *and substantially present ; and the Body and*  
 “ *Blood of Christ are indeed taken by the Receiv-*  
 “ *ers.*

There seems to have been one singular Notion in this Confession, That the Real and Substantial Presence lasts no longer than the Ministration ; but that is nothing to our Argument, as long as a *substantial Presence* is asserted.

In the Year 1536 an Assembly of the Divines of the *Ausburg* Confession on one side, and the Divines of *Upper Germany* on the other, conven'd at *Wirtemberg*, by the procurement and mediation of *Bucer*, who undertook to moderate between both parties ; where they agreed in this form of Confession. “ *We believe according to the words of Irenæus, That the Eucharist consists of two things, one Earthly the other Heavenly ; and therefore believe and teach, That the Body and Blood of Christ are truly and substantially exhibited and received with the Bread and Wine.* This is subscribed by the chief Divines of both Parties, and approved by the *Helvetian* Ministers themselves.

The *Bohemian Waldenses* in their Confession of Faith presented to *Ferdinand*, King of the *Romans* and *Bohemia*, declare expressly, That the Bread and Wine, are the very Body and Blood of Christ ; and that Christ is in the Sacrament

crament with his *Natural Body*, but by another way of Existence than at the Right-hand of God.

In the *Greek* Form of Consecration, this Prayer was used: *Make this Bread the precious Body of thy Christ; and that which is in this Cup, the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing them by thy Holy Spirit; which words are taken out of the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil.*

And *Jeremias* the Learned Patriarch of Constantinople, in his Declaration of the Faith of the *Greek Church* in Answer to the *Lutheran Divines*, affirms *That the Catholick Church believes, that after the Consecration the Bread is changed into the very Body of Christ, and the Wine into the very Blood, by the Holy Spirit.*

In the Year 1570. was held a Council in Poland of the Divines of the *Ausburg*, the *Helvetian*, and the *Bohemian* Confessions, in which they agreed in this Declaration. *As to that unhappy Controversie of the Supper of our Lord, We agree in the Sence of the Words, as they are rightly understood by the Fathers, particularly by Irenæus, who affirms that the Mystery consists of two things, one Earthly, and another Heavenly. Neither do we affirm, that the*

*Elements and Signs are meer naked and empty Things signified to Believers.*

*But to speak more clearly and distinctly, we agree that we believe and confess the substantial Presence of Christ is not only signified to Believers, but is really held forth, distributed and exhibited, the Symbols being joined with the thing it self, and not meerly naked, according to the nature of Sacraments. This Confession was confirmed at several times, by several following Synods in the same Kingdom, at Cracow 1573. at Peterkaw 1578. at Walhoff 1583.*

The First Man that opposed the real and substantial Presence was *Caroloftadius*, Archdeacon of *Wirtenberg*, of whom the candid and ingenious *Melancthon* gives this Character : That he was a furious Man, void both of Wit, Learning, and common Sence, not capable of any Act of Civility or good Manners ; so far from any appearances of Piety, that there are most manifest Footsteps of his Wickedness. He condemns all the Civil Laws of the Heathen Nations, as Unlawful, and would now have all Nations governed by the judicial Law of *Moses*, and embrac'd the whole Doctrine of the *Anabaptists*.

He sets up the Controversie about the Sacraments against *Luther*, meerly out of Envy and Emulation,

Emulation, not out of any Sence of Religion, and much more to the same Purpose: The Truth of all which (he says) a great part of Germany both can and will attest. Tho the greatest Proof of his Levity is his own Writing, when all that Disorder and Schism that he made in the Church, of which he profess'd himself a Member, was founded upon no better Bottom than this slender Nicety, That when our Saviour said this is my Body, he pointed not to the Bread but to himself.

But in this he is vehemently opposed by his Master Luther, in behalf of a true Corporeal Presence, especially in his Book *Contra Cælestes Prophetas seu Fanaticos*; wherein he lays down this Assertion, "*That by the Demonstrative Pronoun hoc, Christ is declared to be Truly and carnally present with his Body in the Supper, and that the Communication of the Body of Christ, of which St. Paul speaks, is to eat the Body of Christ in the Bread, neither is that Communication Spiritual only but Corporeal, as it is in the personal Union of Christ: So we are to conceive of the Sacrament, in which the Bread and the Body make up one thing, and after an incomprehensible manner, which no Reason can Fathom, become one Essence or Mass, from whence, as Man becomes God, so the Bread becomes the Body.*"

And in a Sermon preached by him the same Year at *Wirtemberg*, against the *Sacramentarian Hereticks*, as he calls them: "*The Devil opposes us by his Fanatick Emiffaries in the Blaspheming the Supper of our Lord, that dream the Bread and Wine are there only given as a Sign or Symbol of our Christian Profession, nor will allow that the Body and Blood of Christ are there present themselves, tho the Words are exprefs and perspicuous: Take, eat, this is my Body.* In this Controversie he was engaged all his Life, against *Carlostadius*, and other *Apostates* from the *Ausburg Confession*, giving them no better Titles than of *Fanaticks*, *Hereticks*, *Betrayers of Christ*, *Blasphemers of the Holy Ghost*, and *Seducers of the World*.

And in his last Book against the *Divines of Lovain* in the Year 1545, the Year before his Death, he makes this solemn Declaration. "*We seriously believe the Zuinglians, and all Sacramentarians, that deny the Body and Blood of Christ to be received Ore carnali, in the Blessed Sacrament, to be Hereticks, and no Members of the Church of Christ: So that hitherto it is evident, That the whole Body of the true Old Protestants, both in their publick Confessions and private Writings, unanimously asserted the Corporeal and Substanti-*



*al Presence*, as they use the Words promiscuously.

As for the *Calvinian Churches*, *Grotius* hath observed very truly, That the *Calvinists* express themselves in a quite different Language, in their *Confessions*, from what they do in their *Disputations*, where they declare themselves more frankly. In their *Confessions* they tell you, That the Body and Blood of Christ, are taken Really, Substantially, Essentially; but when you come to Discourse 'em closer, the whole Business is *Spiritual*, without Substance, only with a signifying Mystery; and all the reality is turned into a receiving by Faith; which, says he, is a perfect contradiction to the Doctrine of the whole Catholick Church.

So they declare in the Conference at *Presburg* with the *Lutherans*, That in the Sacrament, Christ indeed gives the Substance of his Body and Blood by the working of the Holy Ghost.

And when *Luther* signify'd to *Bucer*, his Jealously of the Divines of *Strasburgh* and *Bazil*, as if they believed nothing to be present in the Sacrament, but the Bread and Wine. *Bucer* returns this Answer, in the name, and with the consent of all his Brethren; "This is their Faith and Doctrine concerning the Sacrament, That in it, by the Institution and Power of our Lord,

“Lord, his true Body and his true Blood are  
 “indeed exhibited, given and taken, together  
 “with the visible Signs of Bread and Wine (as  
 “his own Words declare.) This is the Doctrine  
 “not only of Zuinglius, and Oecolampadius, but  
 “the Divines of Upper Germany have declared  
 “the same, in their publick Confessions and Writ-  
 “ings.

“So that the Difference is rather about the man-  
 “ner of the Absence and Presence, than about  
 the Presence or Absence themselves.

And the Reformed French Church in the  
 year 1557. declare themselves much after the  
 same manner, to a Synod of Reform'd German  
 Divines, held at Wormes. We confess that in  
 the Supper of our Lord, not only all the Benefits  
 of Christ, but the very Substance of the Son of  
 Man, the very Flesh, and the very Blood that he  
 shed for us, to be there not meerly signify'd, or  
 Symbolically, Typicallly, or Figuratively, as a  
 Memorial of a thing absent, but truly held forth,  
 exhibited and offered to be receiv'd, together with  
 the Symbols, that are by no means to be thought  
 naked, which by virtue of God's Promise, always  
 have the thing it self truly and certainly conjoin'd  
 with them, whether they are given to the good or  
 to the bad.

But what need of more Witnesses, when Cal-  
 vin himself, the very Urim and Thummim of the  
 the

the Calvinian Churches, declares his Sence in these exprels Words. "I affirm that Christ is *Instit. Book*  
 "indeed given by the Symbols of Bread and *4. cap. 17.*  
 "Wine, and by consequence his Body and Blood, *Sect. 11.*  
 "in which he fulfilled all Righteousness for our  
 "Justification, and as by that, we were ingrafted  
 "into his Body, so by this are we made Parta-  
 "kers of his Substance, by Virtue of it we feel  
 "the Communication of all good Things to our  
 "selves.

"But as to the Modus, if any Man inquire of *Sect. 32.*  
 "me, I am not ashamed to confess that the Mystery  
 "is too sublime for my Wit to comprehend, or to  
 "express; and to speak freely, I rather feel than  
 "understand it, and therefore here without Contro-  
 "versie I embrace the Truth of God, in which I  
 "am sure I may safely acquiesce. He affirms that  
 "his Flesh is the Food of my Soul, and his Blood  
 "the Drink. It is to these Aliments that I offer  
 "my Soul to be nourished. He commands me in  
 "his Holy Supper, under the Symbols of Bread  
 "and Wine to take, eat, and drink, his Body  
 "and Blood, and therefore I doubt not but he  
 "gives it. Here, besides the exprels Words  
 themselves, if there be so much Mystery in the  
 thing as he affirms, there is much more than  
 meer Figure.

And in another Passage he thus expresses  
 himself. "That God doth not trifle in vain Signs,  
 "but

" but does in good earnest perform what is repre-  
 " sented by the Symbols, viz. the Communication  
 " of his Body and Blood, and that the Figure  
 " conjoined with the Reality, is represented by the  
 " Bread, and the Body of Christ is offered and  
 " exhibited with it, the true Substance is given  
 " us, the Reality conjoined with the Sign, so that  
 " we are made Partakers of the Substance of the  
 " Body and Blood. This is expresse enough.

But yet in his Book *de Cæna Domini*, he declares his Sence much more fully.

" If notwithstanding (saith he) it be enquired  
 " whether the Bread be the Body, and the Wine  
 " the Blood of Christ; I answer, that the Bread  
 " and Wine are the visible Signs that represent the  
 " Body and Blood, and that the Name of the  
 " Body and Blood is given to them, because they  
 " are the Instruments by which our Lord Jesus  
 " Christ is given to us.

" This form of Speech is very agreeable to the  
 " thing it self, for seeing the Communion that we  
 " have in the Body of Christ is not to be seen  
 " with our Eyes, nor comprehended by our Under-  
 " standings, yet 'tis there manifestly exposed to  
 " our Eye-sight; of which we have a very pro-  
 " per Example in the same case: When it pleased  
 " God that the Holy Ghost should appear at the  
 " Baptism of Christ he was pleased to represent it  
 " under the appearance of a Dove; and John the  
 Baptist,

“Baptist, giving an Account of the Transaction,  
 “only relates that he saw the Holy Ghost descend-  
 “ing; so that if we consider rightly we shall find  
 “that he saw nothing but the Dove, for the Es-  
 “sence of the Holy Ghost is invisible: But he know-  
 “ing the Vision not to be a vain Apparition, but  
 “a certain Sign of the Presence of the Holy Ghost  
 “represented to him in that manner, that he was  
 “able to bear the Representation.

“The same thing is to be said in the Communi-  
 “on of our Saviour’s Body and Blood, That it is a  
 “Spiritual Mystery, neither to be beheld with  
 “Eyes, nor comprehended with humane Under-  
 “standing, and therefore is represented by Figures  
 “and Signs, that ( as the weakness of our Nature  
 “requires ) fall under our Senses, so as ’tis not a  
 “bare and simple Figure, but conjoin’d with its  
 “Reality and Substance: Therefore the Bread is  
 “properly called the Body, when it doth not only  
 “represent it, but also brings it to us.

“And therefore we will readily grant, That the  
 “Name of the Body of Christ may be transferr’d  
 “to the Bread, because it is the Sacrament and  
 “Emblem of it ; but then we must add, that the  
 “Sacrament is by no means to be separated from  
 “the Substance and Reality.

“And that they might not be confounded, it is  
 “not only convenient, but altogether necessary, to  
 “distinguish between them, but intolerably absurd

"to divide one from the other. Wherefore when we  
 "see the visible Sign what it represents, we ought  
 "to reflect from whom it is given us, for the  
 "Bread is given as a Representation of the Bo-  
 "dy of Christ, and we are commanded to eat  
 "it.

"It is given, I say, by God, who is infallible  
 "Truth, and then if God cannot deceive nor lye,  
 "it follows that He in reality gives whatever is  
 "there represented: And therefore it is necessary  
 "that we really receive the Body and Blood of  
 "Christ, seeing the Communion of both is repre-  
 "sented to us.

"For to what purpose should he command us  
 "to eat the Bread and drink the Wine, as signi-  
 "fying his Body and Blood, if without some spiri-  
 "tual Reality we only received the Bread and  
 "Wine? Would he not vainly and absurdly have  
 "instituted this Mystery, and as we Frenchmen  
 "say, by false Representations?

"Therefore we must acknowledge that if God  
 "gives us a true Representation in the Supper,  
 "that the invisible Substance of the Sacrament is  
 "joined with the visible Signs, and as the Bread  
 "is distributed by hand, so the Body of Christ is  
 "communicated to us to be Partakers of it. This  
 "certainly, if there were nothing else, ought abun-  
 "dantly to satisfy us, when by it we understand,  
 "that in the Supper of our Lord, Christ gives us  
 "the



„ the true and proper Substance of his Body and  
 „ Blood.

Thus far *Calvin* : And I think it is as high a Declaration of the *real* and *substantial* Presence, as I have met with in any Author whatsoever. And if in any other Passages the great *Dictator* may have been pleased to contradict himself, that is, the old *Dictatorian* Prerogative of that Sect, as well as the old *Romans*, That whatever Decrees they made, however *inconsistent*, they were always *Authentick*.

Neither doth *Beza* at all fall short of his adored Master in the Point of *substantial* Presence : In his Book against *Westfalus* a Sacramentarian, *de Coena Domini*. He declares freely that the *no pñter*, or grammatical Sence of our Saviour's Words, *This is my Body*, cannot be preserved without *Transubstantiation*, and that there is no Medium between *Transubstantiation* and a *meer Figure* : And yet the whole Design of the Book is to prove the *real* Presence in the Sacrament, in opposition to the *Figurative*.

And in the Year 1561, The Protestant Churches of *France* held a Synod at *Rochel*, and the Year following at *Nimes*, in both which *Beza* sat as President, where the *substantial* Presence was maintain'd, and defin'd with great Vehemence against the Innovators (as they were then esteemed;) for when *Morellus* mov'd to have the

Word *Substance* taken out of their Confession of Faith, *Beza* and the Synod, not without some Indignation, decree against them.

This Decree *Beza* declares in his Epistle to the Ministers of *Zurick*, dated May the 17th. 1572, to extend to the Protestants of *France* only, least they who were *Zuinglians* should take Offence at it as a Censure particularly designed against themselves.

But the highest Declaration of the *French* Protestants is that sent by their Embassadors to the *German* Divines assembled at *Wormes* Anno 1557. in which Business *Beza* was chief Manager. *We confess*, say they, *that in the Supper of our Lord, not only all the Benefits of Christ, but the very Substance of the Son of Man, the very real Flesh, the very Blood that he shed for us, not only to be signified or Symbolically, Typically, or Figuratively to be proposed as the Memorial of a thing absent; but to be truly represented, exhibited and offered to be received; the Symbols by no means to be thought naked, being annexed, which because of the Promise and Engagement of God, always have the thing it self truly and certainly conjoin'd, whether given to the Good or to the Bad.*

But these Civilities and Condescensions were made in their low Ebbs of Fortune: For whenever they could flatter themselves with any Advantage of Interest, no Accommodations would serve

serve their Turn. Thus at the famous Conference at *Poissy*, before *Charles* the Ninth, Anno 1561, where they supposed themselves warm, and powerful enough, by the Favour of the Queen-Mother ( who supported them for her own Ends of State ) and some great Ministers of State, who ( by the way ) soon after proved Rebels, I mean *Coligny* and his Faction; *Beza*, who was the chief Manager in behalf of the Protestants, runs high in his Demands: " *As*  
 " *to the Eucharist*, says he, *the Body of Christ is*  
 " *as far distant from it, as the highest Heaven*  
 " *from the Earth: For our selves and the Sacra-*  
 " *ments are upon the Earth, but Christ's Flesh is*  
 " *in Heaven so glorified, that it hath not lost the*  
 " *Nature, but the Infirmary of a Body. So that we*  
 " *are Partakers of his Body and Blood only after a*  
 " *spiritual way, or by Faith.*

This Boldness highly offended the Queen; and therefore he afterwards endeavoured to excuse himself by Palliations and softning Expressions, but after all, to avoid farther Equivocation, he is hardly pressed to it by the Cardinal of *Lorrain*, whether they would stand to the Confession of *Ausburg*. *Beza* demurs and consults *Calvin*; *Calvin* defies it, and commands him to protest against it. Upon which Occasion *Osiander*, a plain Protestant, in his History makes this Remark upon the *Calvinian* Honesty.

Here-

“ Heretofore ( says he ) when Peace was granted  
“ to the Protestants in Germany, the Calvinists  
“ put in their Claim to their Share in it, because  
“ they own’d the Ausburg Confession ( and it was  
“ subscrib’d by Calvin himself ) notwithstanding  
“ that at the same time they held contradictory  
“ Opinions. But in the Conference at Poissy, when  
“ they presumed that they had Strength and Force  
“ enough to defend their own Doctrines, they open-  
“ ly rejected the Ausburg Confession, when it was  
“ offered them by the Cardinal of Lorrain, to  
“ subscribe as the only Article of Pacification.  
“ And yet after this, when they had not obtained  
“ their Ends , they again in affront to their own  
“ Consciences, cry up the Ausburg Confession as  
“ their only Standard of Faith, not that they ap-  
“ proved it, but under that false Guise to impose  
“ Calvinism upon the plain meaning Lutherans.  
So far the Historian, though the matter of Fact  
is its own best Proof.

This is the short Account of this Controversie in all foreign Churches. All Parties of Christendom agree in the Substance of the Doctrine, even the Calvinists themselves, who, tho they sometimes attempted to deny it, had not Confidence enough to be steady to their own Opinion, but were often forced to submit it to the consent of Christendom.

From all these Premises it is evident, that no one thing in the World is more unfit to be set up for a Test than *Transubstantiation*, seeing all Parties agree in the *thing*, tho not in the *Word*, and yet tho they do, they again disagree in numberless Speculations about it, and when they have done, all Parties unanimously agree that the *Modus* is a thing utterly unknown and incomprehensible. So that take it one way (*i.e.*) as to the thing it self, or the *real Presence*, the Test is a *Defiance* to all *Christendom*; take it the other way, as to the *Modus*, it is nothing at all but only imposing an *unintelligible Thing* upon the Wisdom and Honour of a Nation under the severest Penalties.

As for the Church of *England*, she agrees with the Tradition of the *Catholick Church* both *Roman* and *Reformed*, in asserting the *Certainty* of the *real Presence*, and the *Uncertainty* of the *Manner* of it; tho the true account of it hath been miserably perplexed, and disturbed by the oblique Practices of the *Sacramentarians*.

The first Account we have of it is in our celebrated *Church-Historian* out of *Dr. Stillingfleet's* famous invisible *Manuscript*, whereby as he had before made *Archbishop Cranmer* a meer *Erastian* as to *Discipline*, so now here he makes him a meer *Sacramentarian* as to *Doctrine*.

A Committee of selected Bishops and Divines being appointed in the First Year of King Edward, for examining and reforming the Offices of the Church. The First, because *most material* Point, was the Eucharist, concerning which all things were put into certain Quæries, to which every Commissioner gave in his Answer in Writing. And to the Question concerning the Eucharist, *What is the Oblation and Sacrifice of Christ in the Mass?* Cranmer's Answer is,

"The Oblation and Sacrifice of Christ in the  
 "Mass is not so called, because Christ indeed is  
 "there Offered and Sacrificed by the Priest and  
 "the People, (for that was done but once by him-  
 "self upon the Cross) but it so call'd, because it  
 "is a Memory and Representation of that very true  
 "Sacrifice and Immolation, which before was made  
 "upon the Cross.

This is pure *Zuinglianism*, and in Opposition to it, it is asserted by Six Bishops in a Body.

I think it is the Presentation of the very Body and Blood of Christ, being really present in the Sacrament, which Presentation the Priest makes at the Mass in the name of the Church, unto God the Father, and in Memory of Christ's Passion, and Death upon the Cross, with Thanksgiving therefore, and devout Prayer, that all Christian People, and namely they who spiritually join with  
 the



*the Priest in the said Oblation, and of whom he makes special Remembrance, may attain the Benefit of the said Passion.*

And to these agree the several Answers of Carlisle, and Coventry, and Litchfield, by which (as the Historian well observes) the Reader will perceive how generally the Bishops were addicted to the old Superstition, and how few did agree in all things with Cranmer.

Now this Old Superstition that he finds in this passage, is nothing but the true Old Protestant Doctrine of the real Presence, in opposition to meer Figure and Representation, which is all that is here asserted by the Bishops.

But this is the bold practice of this bold Writer, to make Cranmer the Standard of the Reformation; and this unknown Manuscript the Standard of Cranmer's Opinions; and these two grand Forgeries concerning no Church Government; and the meer Commemorative Presence in the Eucharist, are the two grand singularities of his History; and the main things that gave it popular Vogue and Reputation with his Party; and were these two blind Stories, and the Reasons depending upon them retrench'd, it would be like the shaving of Samson's Hair, and destroy all the strength peculiar to the History.

The Design was apparently laid before the Work was undertaken, that industriously warps all things into *Irenical* and *Eraſtian* Principles, and the vain Man ſeems to have been flattered by his Patrons into all that Pains to give Reputation to their Errors.

And here lay the Fondneſs for the *Stillingſteetian Manuscript*, that it ſo frankly and openly aſſerted *Eraſtian* and *Sacramentarian* Principles as the Bottom of the Reformation. But if ſuch an *unprov'd* and *unwarrantable* piece of Paper, without any certain Conveyance or Tradition, without any Notice of ſo publick a Tranſaction in any contemporary Writer, without any other Evidence of its being genuine, than that it was put providentially into the Hands of Dr. St. when he wrote his *Irenicum*, muſt be ſet up for undoubted Record, againſt all the Records of the Churches, our great Hiſtorian would be well advis'd to employ his Pains in writing Lampoons upon the preſent Princes of *Chriſtendom* (eſpecially his own) which he delights in moſt, becauſe it is the worſt thing that himſelf can do, than collecting the Records of former times. For the Firſt will require Time and Poſtage to purſue his Malice, but the Second is eaſily trac'd in the Chimney Corner.

And therefore I would deſire theſe Gentlemen either to give a better Account of the Deſcent  
and

and Genealogy of the Paper, than that it came to Dr. St. by Miracle; or else to give it less Authority.

But to proceed, a new Office for the Communion-Service was drawn up in the same Year by the Bishops, in compiling of which *Cranmer* had the chief hand, and by his great Power over-ruled the rest at Pleasure; in this Service he retains the old Form of Words used in the ancient *Missals*, when there was no *Zuinglianism* or Doctrine of figurative Presence in the Christian World, and the real Presence was universally believed as appears by the very Words of Distribution.

**The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul unto everlasting Life. And the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, &c.**

This was the Form prescribed in the First Liturgy of *Edward the 6th.* and agreeable to this are the King's own Injunctions published at the same time, where the Eucharist is call'd the *Communion* of the *very Body and Blood* of Christ, by which Form of Words they then expressed the real Presence as *oppos'd* to *Zuinglianism*.

This Liturgy being thus established, and withal abetted by Act of Parliament, for some time kept up its Authority in the Church against all Opposition; though it was soon encountred with

Enemies enough both at Home and abroad out of the *Calvinian* Quarters.

At the end of the Year ensuing *Peter Martyr*, a rank *Sacramentarian*, came over, and after much Conversation with *Cranmer*, he was plac'd *Regius Professor* in *Oxford*, where he soon rais'd Tumults about the *Zuinglian* and *Sacramentarian* Doctrines.

But *Bucer*, that prudent and moderate Reformer, came not till some time after, though invited at the same time: And so either came too late or departed too soon; for as he came over in *June* so he dy'd in *January*, so that tho he were a great Assertor of the *real Presence* (as our *Church-Historian* himself often observes) he had not a Season to sow his Doctrine, and *Martyr* reigning alone, and being a furious Bigott in his Principles, it is no wonder if *Zuinglianism* spread with so much Authority.

But the most fatal Blow to the Reformation of the Church of *England* was given by *Calvin's* Correspondence with the *Protector*, and afterwards with *Dudley*, taking upon him to *censure*, *expunge*, *reform*, *impose*, at his own Pleasure; the Malignity of whose Influence first discovered it self in the Ceremonial War against a Cap and a Tippet, but soon wrought into the Vitals of the Reformation, especially, as to the Liturgy and the Eucharist; both which must be removed

removed to give way to the *Zuinglian* Errors.

This Alteration was made in the 5<sup>th</sup>. Year of the Kings Reign, tho precisely when, and by what Persons, is utterly unknown, only it is remark'd by our Church-Historian to have followed immediately after the Consecration of Hooper. *When* (as he observes) the Bishops being generally addicted to the *Purity of Religion*, spent most of this Year in preparing Articles which should contain the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. Among which the 29<sup>th</sup>. condemns the real Presence, as the new Liturgy, to which they are annexed, had before almost run it up to the Charge of Idolatry. Pag. 166.

For they were not content to abolish the old Missal Form of Distribution. **The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul unto everlasting Life. Take and eat this, &c.** But instead of it appoint this *Zuinglian* Form, **Take and eat this** (*without any mention of the Body and Blood of Christ*) **in remembrance that Christ died for thee. &c.**

Neither were these Innovators ( whoever they were ) satisfied with the Alteration of the old Form; but add a fierce Declaration to bar the Doctrine of Real and Essential Presence.

*Whereas it is ordered in this Office of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants*

cants should receive the same Kneeling ( which order is well meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein, given to all worthy Receivers, and for avoiding such Prophanation and Disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue. ) Yet least the same Kneeling should by any Persons, either out of Ignorance and Infirmity, or out of Malice and Obstinacy be misconstrued and deprav'd, it is here declared that no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done unto any real or essential Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood, for the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural Substances, and therefore may not be ador'd, ( for that were Idolatry to be abhorr'd by all faithful Christians ) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here. It being against the Truth of Christ's natural Body, to be at one time in more places than one.

And whereas a body of Articles was composed at the same time, it is declared in the 29th. Article, That since the very being of humane Nature doth require, That the Body of one and the same Man, cannot be at one and the same time in many places, but of necessity must be in some certain and determinate place; therefore the Body of Christ cannot be present in many different places at the same time. And since as the Holy Scriptures testify Christ hath been taken up into Heaven, and  
there



*there is to abide till the end of the World, it becomes not any of the Faithful to believe or profess, that there is a real or corporeal Presence ( as they Phrase it ) of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.*

This Declaration, though it seem'd to be aim'd with a particular Malice against the *Lutherans*, and their peculiar manner of Asserting and Explaining the real Presence, yet it strikes at the general Doctrine it self, held in all Churches. And as these were the great Alterations made at that time; so who were the Authors and Contrivers of 'em is so utterly unknown to Historians, that they are not so much as able to conjecture.

Doctor *Heylin* would ascribe it either to the Convocation it self, or some Committee appointed by it. But this is the officious Kindness of the good Man to help out the poor oppressed Church at that time, at a dead Lift, having no Record or Authority for his Assertion.

Doctor *Burnet* has often heard it said, That the Articles were fram'd by *Cranmer* and *Ridley*. But whoever told him so, knew no more than himself; I am sure it is the meanest Trade in an Historian to stoop to Hear-says.

All that can be conjectured of it, is; That it was done at that unhappy time when *Dudley* Governed all, who when he form'd his great and ambitious Designs, first (as the Historian Remarks) endea-

endeavour'd to make himself Popular; and to this end, among other Arts, he made himself Head and Patron of the *Calvinian* Faction, and entertain'd the Establish'd Church with Neglect and Contempt; and therefore I find not Ecclesiastical Matters referr'd to the advice of the Regular *Ecclesiastical Order*, but were either Transacted by Himself, and his Agents in private, or some *incompetent Lay-Authority*.

As to this matter of the New Liturgy and Articles, there is no Record but an Act of Parliament, by which they are Impos'd and Authoriz'd.

Anno 5to.  
& 6to. Edw.  
6ti.

"Whereas there hath been a very Godly Order set forth by the Authority of Parliament for Common-Prayer, and Administration of the Holy Sacraments, to be used in the Mother Tongue within this Church of England, agreeable to the Word of God, and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all good People, desiring to live in Christian Conversation, and most profitable to the Estate of this Realm; upon the which, the Mercy, Favour, and Blessing of Almighty God is in no wise so readily and plenteously pour'd, as by Common-Prayers, due using of the Sacraments, and often Preaching of the Gospel with the Devotion of the Hearers; and yet this notwithstanding a great number of People in divers parts of this Realm, following their own sensuality, and living either without Knowledge, or due Fear of God, do willfully and dam-

“ damnation before Almighty God, abstain and  
“ refuse to come to their Parish Churches, and other  
“ places where Common-Prayer, and Administration  
“ of the Sacraments, and preaching of the Word of  
“ God, is used upon Sundays and other Days, or-  
“ dain’d to be Holy-days.

“ II. For Reformation hereof be it enacted  
“ by the King our Sovereign Lord, With  
“ the assent of the Lords and Commons in  
“ this present Parliament assembled, and by  
“ the Authority of the same, that from and  
“ after the Feast of All-Saints next coming,  
“ all and every person and persons inhabiting  
“ within this Realm, or any other the King’s  
“ Majesty’s Dominions, shall diligently and  
“ faithfully (having no lawful or reasonable  
“ excuse to be absent) endeavour themselves  
“ to resort to their Parish Church or Chapel  
“ accustomed, or upon reasonable let thereof,  
“ to some usual place, Where Common-Pray-  
“ er, and such Service of God shall be used  
“ in such time of Let, upon every Sunday,  
“ and other days ordained and used to be  
“ kept as Holy-days, and then and there to  
“ abide orderly and soberly during the time  
“ of the Common-Prayer, preachings, or  
“ other Service of God there to be us’d and  
“ ministred, upon pain of Punishment by the  
“ Censures of the Church.

“III. And for the due execution hereof, the  
“King’s most Excellent Majesty, the Lords  
“Temporal, and all the Commons in this  
“present Parliament assembled, doth in God’s  
“name earnestly require and charge all Arch-  
“bishops, Bishops, and their Ordinaries,  
“that they shall endeavour themselves to the  
“uttermost of their knowledges, that the  
“due and true execution thereof may be had  
“throughout their Diocesses and Charges,  
“as they will answer before God for such  
“Evils and Plagues, wherewith Almighty  
“God may justly punish his People, for  
“neglecting this good and wholesome Law.

“IV. And for their Authority in this be-  
“half, be it further likewise enacted by the  
“Authority aforesaid, That all and singu-  
“lar the same Archbishops, Bishops, and  
“all other their Officers, exercising Ecclesi-  
“astical Jurisdiction, as well in place Ex-  
“empt, as not Exempt, within their Dio-  
“cesses, shall have full Power and Autho-  
“rity by this Act, to Reform, Correct, and  
“punish by Censures of the Church all  
“and singular persons which shall offend  
“within any their Jurisdictions or Diocesses,  
“after the said Feast of All-Saints next com-  
“ing, against this Act and Statute; any  
“other Law, Statute, Privilege, Liberty,

“ or Provision heretofore made, had, or suffered to the contrary notwithstanding.

“ V. And because there is risen in the use  
“ and exercise of the aforesaid common Service  
“ in the Church, heretofore set forth, divers  
“ doubts for the fashion or manner of the  
“ Ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the Minister and Mistakers, than of any other worthy cause; therefore, as well for the more plain and manifest  
“ Explanation thereof, as for the more perfection of the said Order or Common Service, in some places, where it is necessary to make the same prayer and fashion of  
“ Service, more earnest and fit to stir  
“ Christian People to the true honouring of  
“ Almighty God, the King's most Excellent Majesty, with the assent of the Lords and  
“ Commons of this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, hath caused the aforesaid Order, or Common Service, Intituled, The Book of Common-Prayer, to be faithfully and godly  
“ perused, explained, and made fully perfect, and by the aforesaid Authority hath annexed and joined it, so explained and perfected, to this present Statute, &c.

In this new Office, beside the forementioned alterations in the Liturgy it self, there was ordered

der'd in the Rubrick, the Abolition of *Copes* and *Hoods*; neither is it altogether unobservable, that at this time *Hopkins* his Psalms broke in upon the service of the Church.

But in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, when the Reformation was settled in that State, in which it ever after continued, that new Declaration of the Second Liturgy of King *Edward* was rejected; together with the 29th. Article, and the First old Form of Distribution was restored. And thats a clear Declaration of the Sence of this Church for a real and essential Presence; when it was so particularly concern'd to have all Bars against it remov'd. And from that time forward, the most eminent Divines in it, were successively from Age to Age the most Assertors of it.

It were in vain to recite the numberless Passages to that Purpose, it having been so often done by other Hands. A List of the Names of the principal Authors may be seen in the late Bishop of *Durham's Historia Transubstantiationis*, *John Poinet*, Bishop of *Winchester*, who wrote a very learned Book upon the Argument, entitled *Diallaeticon*, to explain the Sence of the Church of *England* about it; *John Jewel*, Bishop of *Salisbury*, the learned Bishops *Andrews* and *Bilson*, *Isaac Casaubon* in the Name and by the Command of King *James* the First, in his Answer to Cardinal



dinal Perron ; Mr. Hooker ; John, Bishop of Rochester ; Montague, Bishop of Norwich ; James, Primate of Armagh ; Francis, Bishop of Ely ; Archbishop Laud ; Bishop Overal, and the Archbishop of Spalato.

To this Catalogue variety of other Writers might be added, but either here are Witnesses enough, or there never can be. Neither need I produce their Testimonies, when they are so vulgarly known, and have been so frequently recited.

I shall content my self with the Two principal, the most learned and reverend Prelates *Poynet* and *Andrews*.

The First wrote his *Diallacticon* concerning the Truth, Nature and Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. A Book much approved and often commended by *Grotius*, (tho he knew not the Author) as the best Discourse upon the Argument, and the most proper Method to restore the Peace of the Christian Church in that Point, which he further says was for that purpose translated into *French* by a reformed Divine, by the Advice of his Brethren. I have not the Book by me, but the Design and fundamental Assertion is to prove ( as *Dr. Cosins* recites it ) that the Eucharist is *not only a Figure* of the Body of our Lord, but contains in it the *Verity, Nature and Substance* ; and therefore that these Terms ought not to be exploded, because

*Animad.  
Cass. Artic.  
10. in Ani-  
mad. Riveti.  
Votum pro  
Pace Art. 10.  
River. Apol.  
discuss.*

the Ancients generally used them in their Discourses upon this Argument.

But Bishop *Andrews* his Passage, though grown Vulgar and Thread-bare, by being so continually quoted, best deserves our Observation, because by that means it is made not only a Declaration of his own Sense, but of all that followed him in it, and that is of almost all the learned Men of the Church of *England*, that have succeeded from that time. The Passage is in his Answer to *Bellarmino* in these Words.

*The Cardinal is not ignorant, except wilfully, that Christ hath said, This is my Body. Now about the Object we are both agreed; all the Controversy is about the Modus. We firmly believe that it is the Body of Christ, but after what manner it is made to be so, there is not a Word extant in the Gospel, and therefore we reject it from being a Matter of Faith. We will, if you please, place it among the Decrees of the Schools; but by no means among the Articles of Religion. What Durandus said of old, we approve of. We hear the Word, feel the Effect, know not the Manner, believe the Presence. And so we believe the Presence too, and that real no less than your selves: Only we define nothing rashly of its Modus, neither do we curiously inquire into it; no more than how the Blood of Christ cleanseth us in our Baptism; no more than how in the Incarnation of Christ the*  
*Humane*

*Humane Nature is united to the Divine. We rank it in the Order of Mysteries ( and indeed the whole Eucharist it self is nothing but Mystery ) what remains beside, ought to be consumed by Fire, that is as the Fathers elegantly express it, to be ador'd by Faith, not examined by Reason.*

This was his State of the Controversie, that was then perus'd and approv'd of by King *James*, and ever after retained by the Divines of the Church of *England* down to the Rebellion and Subversion of Church and State, and then it was carried into Banishment with its Confessors. For whilst his late Majesty resided at *Cologn*, it was there commonly objected, in his own Presence, by the *Roman* Divines against the Church of *England*, That all its Members were meer *Zuinglians* and *Sacramentarians*, that believed only an imaginary Presence.

Upon this *Dr. Cosins*, who was then Dean of the Chapel Royal, by his Majesties Command writes a Discourse to vindicate the Church of *England* from that Calumny, and to give an Account of its Sence concerning the true and real Presence; in which he declares himself to the same purpose with all the forementioned Authors, all along vehemently asserting the true reality of the Presence, and still declaring the *Modus* to be ineffable, unsearchable, above our Senses, and above our Reason.

So that still all Parties are agreed in the thing it self, were it not for that one mistaken Supposition, That the Church of *Rome* hath not only defin'd the *Matter*, but the *Manner*, which she is so far from pretending to attempt, that before she proceeded to decree any thing about it, she declar'd that it was so *incomprehensible*, that it was not capable of being defin'd, as we see all Christendom hath done beside.

Now after all this I leave it to the common Sense and Ingenuity of Mankind, whether any thing can be more barbarous and profane than to make the renouncing of a Mystery, so unanimously receiv'd, a *State TEST*. And that is my present Concernment about it, not as a Point of Divinity, but as turned into a Point of State.

Thus far proceeded the Old Church of *England*, which as it was banished, so it was restored with the Crown. But by reason of the long Interval of Twenty Years between the Rebellion and Restitution, there arose a new Generation of Divines that *knew not* Joseph. These Men underhand deserted and undermined the Old Church, as it stood upon *Divine Right*, and *Catholic Principles*, and instead of it crested a New Church of their own Contrivance, consisting partly of *Independency*, partly of *Eraastianism*, with the *Independent*, leaving no standing Authority

riety in the Christian Church over private Christians, but leaving every Man to the arbitrary Choice of his own Communion; with *Erastus* allowing no Jurisdiction to the Christian Church, but what is derived from the Civil Magistrate.

These Principles being Pleasing to the Wantonness of the People, these Men soon grew popular, and soon had the Confidence to call themselves the Church of *England*: But the principal Object of their Zeal was the Destruction of Popery, and the only Measure of Truth; with them, was Opposition to the Church of *Rome*. And therefore they assum'd to themselves the Management of that great and glorious War.

And as they managed it upon new Principles, or indeed, none at all (never writing for our Church, but only against that Church) so they advanced new Arguments to represent the Church of *Rome* as Odious as possible, to the People. Among these the Two most frightful Topicks, were *Transubstantiation* and *Idolatry*. One was a very hard Word, and the other, a very ugly one. These Two Words, they made the Two great Kettle-drums to the Protestant Guards. They were continually beating upon them with all their Force, and whenever they found themselves at any Dis-

K

advantage

advantage with an Enemy (as they often were by pressing too far, for they never thought they did enough in the Cause) by making a Noise upon these Two loud Engines, they could at pleasure drown the Dispute.

Now, ever since this Alteration of the State of the War between the Two Churches, we hear little or nothing at all of the *real Presence* in the Cause, but it is become as great a Stranger to the (*i. e. their*) Church of England as *Transubstantiation* it self, but the whole matter is resolved into a meer Sacramental Figure and Representation, and a Participation only of the Benefits of the Body and Blood of Christ by Faith.

I know not any one Writer of that Party of Men that hath ever own'd any higher Mystery, but on the contrary they state all the Disputes about the Eucharist upon *Sacramentarian Principles*, and with them to assert the true reality of the Presence of our Saviour's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, as naturally resolves it self into *Transubstantiation*, as that does into *Idolatry*.

And the main Argument insisted upon by them, is the natural *Impossibility* of the thing it self to the Divine *Omnipotence*, which beside the prophane Boldness of prescribing Measures to God's Attributes in a Mystery that they do



not comprehend; 'tis, as appears by the Premises, a Defiance to the Practice of all Churches, who have ever acknowledged an *incomprehensible* Mystery, not *subject* to the Examination of *Humane Reason*, but to be imbraced purely upon the Authority of a Divine Revelation.

And therefore that ought to be the only matter of Dispute. For if it be a Divine Revelation (as all Christendom hath hitherto believed) that determines the Case without any further Enquiry; and if any Man will not be satisfied with that Authority, he makes very Bold with his Maker. And Men of those Principles would no doubt, make admirable Work with the Definitions of Articles of Faith by the Four first general Councils.

But to let their new way of Arguing pass, it is these Men that first set up Sacramentarian Principles in this Church, and then blew them into the Parliament House, raising there, every Session, continual Tumults about Religion, and it is to their Caballing with the Members that we owe these new and unpresidented *TESTS*. Perhaps to have their own Decrees and Writings established by Law, and imposed upon the whole Nation as *Gospel*.

In short, if they own a *real Presence*, we see from the Premises how little the Controversie is between that and *Transubstantiation*, as it is truly and ingeniously understood by all reformed Churches. If they do not, they disown the Doctrine both of the Church of England and the Church Catholick, and then if they own only a *figurative Presence* (and it is plain they own *no other*) they stand condemned of *Heresie* by almost all Churches in the Christian World; and if this be the thing intended to be set up (as it certainly is by the Authors and Contrivers of it) by renouncing *Transubstantiation*, then the Result and Bottom of the Law is under this Pretence to bring a new *Heresy* by Law into the Church of England.

And yet upon this Foot I find the Controversie stands at this present Day between the Bishop of Rome, or the Bishop of Condom on one part, and little *Julian* in the Back-shop with his Dragoons on the other part: The Bishop establishes the *Real Presence* in Opposition to the *Figurative*; His Answerer turns the whole Mystery into meer Type and Figure, by setting up a *figurative Interpretation* of the Words of Institution, and yet confesses it at the same time to be somewhat *more than a Figure*.

To this it is reply'd, I would gladly know what that is, which is not the thing it self, but yet is *more than* a meer Figure of it: To this it is answered, That the Presence is Spiritual, but yet Real; but how a Corporeal Substance should have a real Spiritual Presence, is a thing that requires more Philosophy to clear it up than Transubstantiation, or in the Words of the Author himself: *We suppose it to be a plain Contradiction that Body should have any Existence, but what alone is proper to a Body that is Corporeal.*

This is their last Resolution of this Controversie, that a true real Presence is a Contradiction; and so I think is a real spiritual Presence of a bodily Substance.

This Scent the whole Chace follows, and unanimously agree in this Cry, That there is no Presence, but either *meerly Figurative*; and that shuts out all Reality, and is *universally* condemned by all the Reformation; or *meerly Spiritual*, (i.e.) the present Effects and Benefits of the *absent* Body and Blood of Christ, which hath been all along equally cashiered by all other Reformed Churches, as the other grand Scandal of *Zuinglian*ism.

Thus the London Answerer to the Oxford Discourses: *There can be no real Presence, but either Figuratively, in the Elements, or Spiritually*

*Answer to in the Souls of those who worthily receive them.*  
 T. C. Dialogue, p. 66. So Dr. St.

*All which the Doctrine of our Church implies by this Phrase, is only a real Presence of Christ's invisible Power and Grace, so in and with the Elements, as by the faithful receiving of them to convey real and spiritual Effects to the Souls of Men.*

The Oxford Answerer to the Oxford Discourses allows no other *real Presence* but the *virtual Presence*, that is the *meer Effect*.

So the popular Author of the Discourse against *Transubstantiation*, makes no *Medium* between the *meer figurative Presence* and *Transubstantiation*, so that all other Presence, that is not *meerly Figurative*, comes under the Notion of *Transubstantiation*.

Now the gentlest Character he is pleased to give of this Monsieur, is this, That the *Business of Transubstantiation is not a Controversie of Scripture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason, but of downright Impudence against the plain meaning of the Scripture, and all the Sense and Reason of all Mankind.*

But besides the intolerable Rudeness of the Charge against all the Learned Men of the Church of Rome, as the worst of Sots and Ideots, if there be no middle real Presence between *Transubstantiation* and the *Figure*, he hath cast  
 all

all the Protestant Churches into the same Condemnation of *Sots* and *Fools*.

But howsoever rash and preposterous it may be for Persons that believe the real Presence to abjure the Word *Transubstantiation*, yet to determine any part of Divine Worship in the Christian Church to be in its own Nature *Idolatry*, is inhumane and barbarous.

**IDOLATRY** is a Stabbing and Cut-throat Word; its least Punishment is the greatest that can be, both Death and Damnation; and good Reason too, when the Crime is no less than renouncing the true God that made Heaven and Earth. Thus *Exod. 22. 20.* *He that sacrificeth unto any God, save unto the Lord or Jehovah only, he shall be utterly destroyed.* *Deut. 13. 6.* *If thy Brother the Son of thy Mother, or thy Son, or thy Daughter, or the Wife of thy Bosom, or thy Friend which is as thine own Soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other Gods (which thou hast not known, thou nor thy Fathers) namely of the Gods of the People which are round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one end of the Earth unto the other: Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him: Neither shall thine Eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: But thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to Death, and afterward the Hand of all the People.*

People. And thou shalt stone him with Stones, that he die: Because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, from the House of Bondage.

This was the Crime; and this the Punishment of Idolatry, and the Sentence was so severely Executed, that for the setting up the golden Calf, or Symbol of the Sun; that the Egyptians Worship'd, as the supreme Deity, as will appear in its proper place, Three thousand of the Ring-leaders, were put to the Sword by the Command of Moses, *Exod. 32. 27.* And for this Reason it pleased God to destroy the Canaanites from off the Face of the Earth, (i. e.) for giving Divine Worship to false and created Deities in Defiance to the Eternal Creator of it.

So black a Crime as this, that is no less than renouncing God is not lightly to be charged upon any Party of Christians, nor only because of the foulness of the Calumny, but the barbarous Consequences that may follow upon it, to invite and warrant the Rabble; when ever Opportunity favours, to destroy the Roman Catholics and their Images, as the Israelites were commanded to destroy the Canaanites and their Idols.

But



But before so bloody an Indictment be preferr'd against the greatest part of *Christendom*, the Nature of the thing ought to be very well understood. *The Charge is too big for a Scolding Word.* And how inconsistent soever *Idolatry* may be with Salvation, I fear so uncharitable a Calumny (if it prove one) can be of no less damnable Consequence. It is a piece of Inhumanity, that out-does the Salvageness of the *Canibals* themselves, and damns at once both Body and Soul.

And yet after all, we have no other ground for the bold Conceit, than the crude and rash Assertions of some popular Divines, who have no other Measures of Truth or Zeal, but Hatred to Popery; and therefore never spare for hard Words against that Church, and run up all Objections against it into nothing less than Atheism and Blasphemy, of which *Idolatry* is the greatest Instance.

But if they would lay aside their indecent Heats, and soberly enquire into the Nature and Original of *Idolatry*; they would be as much ashamed of the Ignorance of their Accusations, as they ought to be of its Malice. And therefore I shall set down a plain and brief Account of that Argument, that when we understand the easie, obvious, and natural Notion of *Idolatry*, it will for ever expose the Vanity of these Men's Fanatique Pretences. I pray God there be nothing worse at

bottom, seeing it has ever been set up as the Standard against Monarchy.

It is a Subject that hath entertained the most able Pens in the World, but I shall not presume or pretend to be so learned, but shall confine all my Knowledge to the Word of God, chiefly to the *Mosaick Writings*, for there it is fully and clearly stated, the *Mosaick Law* being enacted purely in Opposition to *Idolatry*. Now nothing can be more obvious, than that the Notion of it there is neither more nor less than this: *The Worship of the Heavenly Bodies, the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, or any other visible and corporeal Deity, as the Supreme God, so as to exclude all Sense and Apprehension of a spiritual and invisible Godhead.*

This evidently appears both by the Almightyes several Revelations that he made of himself to the Children of *Israel* to preserve them from it, and from the several Characters and Descriptions, that himself hath upon numberless occasions made of it.

Most learned Men would trace its Original from before the Flood, but they follow their Chase without any Scent, as generally all Antiquaries do, when they pursue into the first Source and Original of things.

The *Jewish Rabbies* (that are of too late a standing to pretend to any Authority in such Antient Matters ; for as they lived not above Six Ages before

fore us, so they had no other Records than what we have, the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets) derive its Original from the Age of *Enos*; but as their Conjecture is founded upon an ambiguous Word, so it is contradicted by the State of the World at that time; for by reason of the long Lives of the Patriarchs from the Creation to the Flood, it is not easie to conceive, That the Memory and Tradition of the late Creation of the World should be worn out in so short a time, *Enos* being *Adam's* Granchild, and living in the same Age with him for some Hundred Years.

But the plain Demonstration that there was no such Impiety before the Flood, is, that *Moses*, when he reckons up the Causes that provok'd God to bring that Judgment upon the World, makes no mention of the Sin of *Idolatry*, of which, if they had been Guilty, as it is a Sin of the first Magnitude, so it would have held the first place in the Indictment.

Others make *Cham* the Father of this Monster, as they do of all other Crimes, but for no other Reason beside his ill Name.

Others derive it from the Tower of *Babel*, which they will have to have been built for an Altar to the Sun, after the Custom of after-times, when they Worshiped him upon High Towers for Altars.

*Maimonides*, and his Followers, find deep Foot-steps in the time of *Abraham*, who was born in *Ur* of the *Chaldees* that is, say they, the Country of the Antient *ZABII*, the Founders of *Idolatry*; and for that reason he was commanded out of his own Country to the Worship of the True God.

But this Dream of the *ZABII* is so modern, and so void of the Authority of any Antient Record, that it proves it self a fond Imposture. Tho in *Abraham's* time (and that was many Centuries after the Flood) we meet with the first Traces of this Apostacy: For that extraordinary Discovery that God was pleased to make of himself as *Supreme Lord of all things*, was made to *Abraham* in Opposition to the *Idolatry* of his own Country, *i.e. Chaldea*, who seemed to have been the first Founders of it, and for that reason God commanded him to leave his Country, his Kindred, and his Fathers House, and sojourn in the Land of *Canaan*, where the Tradition of the Knowledge of the True God seems to have been much better preserved. So that tho there were some Decays from the true Old Religion, yet they were as yet very far from an Universal Apostacy.

Gen. 12. 1.

That

That the Plague was then broke out in *Chaldea*, is evident from the words of *Joshua*, ( 24. 2. ) *Your Fathers dwelt on the other side the River in old time, even Terah the Father of Abraham, and the Father of Nachor, and they serv'd strange Gods.* But when *Abraham* came into *Canaan* ; I find no Records that the Customs of his Country had pass'd the River, but on the contrary evident Instances of their Knowledge of the true God, as Creator of Heaven and Earth.

What can be more plain than the Story of *Melchisedeck*, Priest of the most High God ( a Term appropriate in Scripture to the Supreme Deity ) in his blessing *Abraham*. *Blessed be Abraham of the most High God, Creator of Heaven and Earth.* And when God consumed *Sodom* and *Gomorrah* with Fire from Heaven, *Idolatry* is no where reckoned among the Causes and Provocations of that severe and unusual Judgment ; and had it been one of their crying Sins, it would have been the loudest, and so never have been omitted by the Sacred Historian. And when *Isaac* was forced by Famine into the Country of the *Philistines*, *Abimelech* their King entred into a Solemn and Religious Covenant with him of mutual Defence and Offence, upon this Inducement, that he was the Blessed of the Lord, or the peculiar Favourite of *Jehovah* ; so that as long as himself and *Isaac* were of a side, the Supreme Gods im-

mediate

mediate Providence would be engaged in his Protection.

The first plain Intimation we find of it in *Palestine* is in the History of *Jacob*, after his Conversation with the *Shechemites*, where, upon his departure from that City by God's especial Command, he builds an Altar at *Bethel* to God, and commands his Family to put away their Θεοὶ ἄλλοτριοὶ or *Strange Gods*. And from this time we read of nothing of this Nature till the Deliverance of the Children of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, after they had been detained there Four Hundred and Thirty Years, according to the Hebrew, or Two Hundred and Fifteen according to the *Seventy*, the greatest part of which time was spent in Slavery and Bondage.

But at, and after their Deliverance, we hear of nothing else but Cautions against *Idolatry* or Worship of *Strange Gods*, as if in that long Tract of Time and Misery, they had lost the Tradition of the God of their Ancestors, and by long conversation with the *Egyptians*, had taken up their Masters Religion together with their Burdens ; and it was scarce possible to be otherwise for men in their poor condition, after so long a Tract of Time, than to take up the Religion in publick Practice.



Long custom and conversation naturally inures Men to the Manners of the Country, but Slavery breaks Men to them : And what could be expected from miserable People, who spent all their days in carrying of Clay, gathering Straw, making Bricks, and all Offices of Servility, than that they should serve their Masters Gods, as well as their Masters themselves ? And that this was their case, is evident from the whole Series of the Story.

The first Discovery that the Almighty made of himself, was to *Moses*, in the Burning Bush, where he tells us, *I am the God of thy Fathers*, Exod. 3.6. *the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob* : But this seems to be a New Language to *Moses* ; For he replies, *When I come unto the* Ver. 13. *Children of Israel, and shall say unto them, the God of your Fathers hath sent me unto you, and they shall say to me, what is his Name (or what God is he) what shall I say unto them ?* To this he is commanded to answer, *I am that I am* hath sent you ; that is, the only self existent Being, that is, the only Supreme Deity, and God of your Fathers : And for the truth and demonstration of this, he refers both him and them to the following Miracles.

And when *Moses* was discouraged by the complaints of the People, because of their severe Usage, the Almighty gives him encouragement upon

upon this powerful Motive, *I am Jehovah, or I am the Lord, who will deliver you with a strong Hand, or stretched out Arm, i. e. I am that Omnipotent, self-existent Being*; and that shall be the proof of it, the great Miracles that I will work for your Delivery.

And at the time of their Deliverance he immediately institutes the Passover, not only as a Memorial of the Thing, but as I shall prove afterwards, the strongest Bar against Idolatry.

But as soon as they sat down at the Foot of Mount *Sinai*, which was their first place of Rest, God's first Care was to make further provision against *Idolatry*, where after a fearful and glorious Representation of his Presence, he gives the Ten Commandments, whereof the Four First are directly levell'd against Idolatry.

*First*, He enjoyns the worship of Himself, who by his Almighty Power had delivered them from their *Egyptian Bondage*.

In the next place, He forbids them the Worship of all Idols, *i. e.* as himself describes them, *The likeness, or similitude, of any thing that is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Water under the Earth.* A plain and indeed logical Definition this, that Idolatry is giving the Worship of the Supreme God, to any created corporeal or visible Deity, or any thing that can be represented by an Image, which nothing but corporeal Beings

ings can, and to suppose such a Being the Supreme Deity, is the only true and proper *Idolatry*.

And tho there may seem to be two sorts of it : First, either to Worship a material and created Being as the Supreme Deity : Or Secondly, to ascribe any corporeal Form or Shape to the Divine Nature ; yet in the Result, both are but one ; for to ascribe unto the Supreme God any corporeal Form, is the same thing as to Worship a created Being, for so is every corporeal Substance.

This is, I say, the true and only Notion of *Idolatry* : And all the Strange Gods mentioned in the Scripture, are only some most glorious Pieces of the visible Creation, as I shall prove at large from undeniable Testimonies. And for this reason it was, that the very Angels, by whom this Affair was immediately transacted, never made any appearance in any visible Shape, but only in a *Cloud*, or in a *Glory*, to prevent the very *Peril of Idolatry* ; and therefore *Moses* in his dying and farewell Speech, reminds them over and over, that at *Horeb* they heard the Voice of God, but saw no *Similitude*, with this Application to them, *lest you corrupt your selves*, i. e. by believing that there can be any *Similitude* of the Supreme Godhead. And as this is the literal and plain Sense of the two first Commandments, so it seems to be the only Design of the Third and Fourth : For the English

of the Third, if it were rightly translated, runs thus ; *Thou shalt not give the Name of the Lord thy God to a Vanity or Idol* ; and so the *Septuagint* render it : For the Word *Vanity* and *Idol* are Synonymous in Scripture, because an *Idol* is a vain and empty Thing that represents nothing ; for when it is set up as the Symbol and Image of a Deity that is no Deity, it is the Image of nothing, as *St. Paul* defines it. So that it is not the meer Image it self that is the *Idol*, but the Image as representing a false God, tho it be only a Symbol, and not a Picture of him, as most of the *Heathen* Images were, of the *Sun*, as the *Calf*, and the *Ram*. These are the *Vanities* or Representations of False Gods in Use, at that time, among the Neighbour Nations, that seem to be here properly interdicted in this Commandment.

As for the *Fourth* Commandment, it is the very Sacrament of the Worship of the true God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, in opposition to *Idolatry*, or the Worship of his Creatures, and therefore is prescribed, as it were, as the Holy Day of the Creation, continually to mind the *Jews*, that the God that they Worship, was the God that made the World, and all the Gods that their Neighbours worshiped, particularly the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, his Creatures.

This then being set up as the great Festival, of the Creator of Heaven and Earth, from hence it was that the Precept of not Worshipping of Idols, and Keeping the Sabbath, are so frequently coupled together in Scripture; and that the Breach of the Sabbath is punished in the same manner as *Idolatry* it self.

But I shall treat of this more largely when I come to a Review. At present I have only given a narrow Prospect of the whole matter, but upon a full and open View of the *Mosaick History*, it will appear in full and undeniable Evidence, by these Two Considerations.

*First*, If we consider the great Propensity of the *Israelites* to renounce the Worship of the One True Invisible God, and to return to their accustomed Worship of Idol Gods.

*Secondly*, If we consider that these Gods were nothing else but the Heavenly Bodies, and that the *Sun* was worshiped as the Supreme Deity.

As to the first, their continual Revolts, and Rebellions against that Almighty God, of whose Power they had had so much Experience, could proceed from nothing less than the most inveterate and invincible Prejudices. Their whole History from their first Deliverance to their last Captivity, is nothing but a perpetual Series of Disloyalty against the God of *Israel*, to play the Harlot (as

the Scripture expresses it) or *\*commit Fornication with the Idols of the Gentiles.*

Pfal. 78. We have an accurate Epitome of this whole History, the Miracles that God wrought for them in *Egypt*, in the Wilderness, in the Land of *Canaan*, notwithstanding all which, as they made continual Attempts of Rebellion, so they at last sunk into an universal Apostacy, v. 58. *Provoking him to Anger with their High Places, and moving him to Jealousie with their Graven Images*; so that at length he gave them up into the Hands of their Enemies: And first the Ten Tribes were lead away Captive, and not long after the Tribe of *Judah*, as it immediately follows in the same Psalm, *God was wroth, and greatly abhorred Israel, so that he forsook the Tabernacle of Shiloh, the Tent which he placed among Men, and delivered his Strength into Captivity, and his Glory* (that was the Symbol of his Divine Presence) *into the Enemies hand.*

But to Trace a few Particulars. The first Opportunity they could gain in the Wilderness, after the miraculous Deliverance out of *Egypt*, by the Absence of *Moses*, they set up and worshiped the *Golden Calf*, a Form of Worship they were accustomed to in *Egypt*: what this Idol was, is variously disputed by Learned Men; some will have it to have been made in Imitation of the *Cherubin*, when as yet God had made no Description of them. Others, and almost all the  
learn'd



learn'd, will have it to have been the Idol of *Apis*, or *Serapis*, or *Osyris*, whom the *Egyptians* worshiped by that Symbol; and that it was the same Idol, is certain; but I take it to be much more antient, for as yet we find not any Foot-steps of Divine Worship given to Men and Women. That Folly is of a much younger Date, and seems to have been brought in purely by the *Grecian* Vanity, to derive the Originals of all Nations from Themselves, and to People Heaven with their own Country-men.

Thus they tell us, that this *Apis* was King of the *Argives*, natural Son to King *Jupiter* by *Niobe*, who marrying *Isis*, left his Kingdom, and went into *Egypt*, who teaching the Barbarous People Civility, and the Art of dressing Vines and Agriculture, He was by common consent chosen their King; and after he had Reign'd with extraordinary Wisdom and Mercy, to the great Improvement of the Nation, when he dyed, they deify'd him, and worshiped him under the Image of a *Calf* or *Ox*, all which is pure *Grecian* Fable.

For *Egypt* had been a famous Nation many Hundred Ages, before any of the *Grecian* Deities were born: It was a flourishing Kingdom in the days of *Abraham*: I am sure they knew how to dress their Vines, and plow their Fields, before there was any such Nation as *Greece*, or any of its

its Cantons known by any Records : There was no News of them till the *Trojan War*, and that is the thing objected by all Writers to the *Greeks* both before and since Christianity, that their remotest Antiquity is meer Novelty in comparison of the *Egyptians*, and is confest, by their own best and most antient Writers ; at least in these Antient Times, there were no Men nor Women Deities, Gods or Goddesses.

But when the *Greeks* had stollen their Religion from the Eastern Nations, in requital they furnished them with Gods of their own, and clapt the Heads of one of their own Countrymen upon every antient Idol, thereby gaining Reputation of Antiquity, both to their Nation and Religion, as if they had been as antient as the *Egyptian* and *Oriental* Idolatry.

Thus they fasten this old Idol of the Golden Calf upon King *Apis*, whereas if there ever were any such Man (for the *Greeks* have neither Faith nor Knowledge enough to be believ'd one Word in any matter of Antiquity, either of their own, or other Nations) he was born many Ages after this Idol had been Famous in the World : And in that unknown Interval of which there are no Historical Records, and therefore the whole Story of him, as well as of all the other *Grecian* Gods, is nothing but Fable.

And much more probable it is, that the *Greeks* were so far from bringing a God *Apis* into *Egypt*, that they carried the very word thence: *Apis* being the *Hebrew* and *Egyptian* Word to signify a *Calf*, or a *Bullock*, and so it is rendred by the *Septuagint*. *Jeremiah* 46. 15. in the *Prophetick* Burthen against *Egypt*, *Διὰ τί ἐφυγὼν εἰς ἄλυσιν ὁ μόσχος ὁ ἐκλεχτός σου κύριε ἡσθερ, ὅτι κύριος ἐπαρέδωκε αὐτόν.* Why did your *Apis* fly, or that your beloved *Calf* desert you, because the Lord did drive him? Tho we render it in the *English* Translation, Why are thy valiant Men swept away?

Bochart.  
Dr. Hammond.  
Dr. Spencer.  
Kircher.

So that the *Calf* can be nothing else than an *Old Egyptian* Idol, or Symbol of some Deity, that they had been accustomed to Worship. And therefore thinking themselves betray'd or deserted by *Moses* after Forty Days Absence, (as for this *Moses*, the Man that brought us up out of the Land of *Egypt*, we wot not what is become of him) they force *Aaron* to restore to them the Symbols of their Old Gods to go before them, instead of this new God, that now seem'd to have deserted them, and to those they ascribe their Deliverance out of *Egypt*; and this is the first cheerful Act of Devotion, that they seem to have perform'd since their Deliverance. For as for all their Worship of the True God, especially at the Delivery of the Law, it seems to be forc'd and uneasy, to which they were

were rather over-aw'd by dreadful Appearances, than inclin'd by their own Choice.

And the Solemn Sacrifice that was made immediately after, was the Act of *Moses*, rather than the People, who rather seem'd Spectators, than Actors ; and therefore as soon as they thought themselves quit of him (which was immediately after) they set up their Idol, and were transported in their Devotions towards it, to a Degree of madness. *They rose up early in the Morning, and offered Burnt-Offerings, and brought Peace-Offerings, and the People sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.*

This Solemnity had been endear'd to them by Custom and Education, and there could be no other ground of their great Joy, than that they were restored to the Exercise of their former Religion, and the Worship of their Old Gods, of which the *Calf* was one of the most eminent Symbols, so that when they say that was the God that deliver'd them out of *Egypt*, their meaning is, the God of which That was the *Symbol* or *Representation*, according to the Language of those Times, and indeed of the whole Old Testament, to give the Name of the *Deity* to the *Idol*.

Now at that time we find no other mention of any other Deities, than the *Sun* and *Heavenly Bodies* ; so that this *Calf* could be the Symbol of

no other Gods than the Sun, and therefore was ever reckoned among their *ies* *Ṣāa*, their *holy Animals*, as the *Egyptian Priest* and Antiquary *Manetho* informs us, of which *Aries* and *Taurus* were the chiefest, and both of them consecrated in honour of the *Sun*, being the two first Signs in the Heavens; but the Festival of *Aries* was the most Solemn, when the Sun entring into that Sign, began the Joyful New Year. In Opposition to which the *Israelites* were commanded to cut the Throat of the Paschal Ram upon that very Day, with all the Ceremonies of Contempt, as shall appear more afterward.

This invincible Obstinacy in their Old Religion, notwithstanding the mighty Works God had wrought for their Deliverance, is severely upbraided to them long after by God himself to his Prophet *Amos*, *Have ye offered unto me Sacrifices and Offerings in the Wilderness Forty Years, O House of Israel? But ye have born the Tabernacle of your Moloch, and the Star of your God Remphan, and their Images which ye made to your selves.* Chap. 25, 26.

This is a plain Description of their great averfeness to the Worship of the True God in the Wilderness, when God declares, that in reality they never Worshiped him at all, but stuck close to their old God *Moloch*, which is but a Synonymous Word for the God *Baal*, i. e. the

N

Sun,

Sun, and therefore they are promiscuously us'd in Scripture to expresse one and the same Deity. Thus *Jeremy*, 19. 5. *They have built the High Places of Baal to burn their Sons in the Fire for Burnt Offerings unto Baal.* But Chapter the 32. v. 35. the same Crime is thus exprest, *They built the High Places of Baal to cause their Sons and Daughters to pass through the Fire unto Moloch*; by which it is undeniably evident, that they were but Synonymous Terms for one and the same God; and indeed they are Words of the same Signification, denoting Supreme or Kingly Power, and so were appropriated by them to the Sun, as Sovereign Lord of the Universe.

This strange Inclination of the *Israelites* to Idolatry, or the Worship of *Baal* and *Moloch*, is so vehemently upbraided to them in the Scripture, as shews it to have been inveterate and impetuous beyond Example: So God himself upbraids it to them, that when he did such mighty things for them in their Deliverance from *Egypt*, and only required them to renounce the Idols of *Egypt*, Yet

*Ezek. 20. 7.* *they rebelled against me, and would not hearken to me;*  
*8. They cast not away the Abomination of their Eyes, nor the Idols of Egypt.*

And when *Joshua* had settled them in the Holy Land, he forewarns them to serve the True God sincerely, and to put away the Gods which their Fathers served on the other side the Flood, and in *Egypt*.

By



By which it appears, they had not yet parted with their Old Gods: but the next Generation made a total Revolt; and the Children of Israel Judg. 2. 11. did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim, and they forsook the Lord God of their Fathers, which brought them out of the Land of Egypt, and followed other Gods, of the Gods of the People that are round about them, and bowed themselves unto them, and provoked the Lord to Anger, and they forsook the Lord, and serv'd Baal and Ashteroth.

This whole Book is nothing else but a Narrative of their Sin by Idolatry, their Punishment by Captivity, their Repentance by imploring of the Mercy of the God of Israel, till at last after so many Relapses, they are thus answered by God in their Addresses and Supplications unto him: Ch. 10. 10. And the Children of Israel cryed unto the Lord, saying; We have sinned against thee, both because we have forsaken our God, and also served Baalim: And the Lord said unto the Children of Israel, did not I deliver you from the Egyptians, from the Ammorites, from the Children of Ammon, from the Philistins? Also the Zidonians and the Amalekites and Moabites did oppress you, and you cry'd to me, and I delivered you out of their hand, yet you have forsaken me, and served other Gods, wherefore I will deliver you no more: go and cry unto the Gods that ye have chosen, let them deliver you in the time of your Tribulations. But upon their Reformation they are delivered, and as soon re-

lapſe, of which a Train of Inſtances are to be ſeen in that Book.

Here it may be obſerv'd all along that the Scripture Notion of *Idolatry* is *renouncing and forſaking the True God*, to *Worſhip other Gods*, or *Baalim*, that is, *Idols* of the *Sun*, whom they commonly call'd the *King of Heaven*. And ſo they ſin on, till God ſuffered his own *Ark* (the Symbol of his own Preſence) to be carried into Captivity : They apply themſelves to *Samuel* to intercede for them ; *Samuel* returns them the old Answer that God himſelf had often made, *If ye re-*  
*Sam. 7. 3, 4. turn unto the Lord with all your Hearts, then put away the ſtrange Gods, and Aſhteroth from among you, and prepare your Hearts unto the Lord, and ſerve him only, and he will deliver you out of the Hands of the Philiftins : Then the Children of Iſrael put away Baal and Aſhteroth, and ſerved the Lord only.*  
*Cap. 12.*

And *Samuel* at the reſigning of his Government, upon the Election of *Saul*, upbraids them with their continual Ingratitude againſt the Lord their God, from their firſt Deliverance out of *Egypt* to that very Day, *in forſaking the Lord to ſerve Baalim*. So plain is the practical Notion of *Idolatry* through the whole Sacred Hiſtory.

Under the pious Reigns of *David* and *Solomon* the Sin of *Idolatry* was competently well retrench'd, till the Dotage of *Solomon*, when his *Wives* and *Concubines* turn'd away his Heart after  
 other

other Gods, So that Solomon went after Ashteroth the <sup>1 King. 11.</sup> Goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcom the Abo-<sup>4, 5.</sup> mination of the Ammonites. But the great Revolt was made by Jeroboam, upon the Division of the Kingdom, tho rather upon a Political than Religious Account. Jeroboam said in his Heart, now shall <sup>1 King. 12.</sup> the Kingdom return to the House of David, if this Peo-<sup>16.</sup> ple go up to do Sacrifice in the House of the Lord at Jerusalem; whereupon he makes two Calves of Gold, and said to the People, It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem, behold thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt.

It was only an Artifice to oblige the People to himself by restoring to them their old Egyptian Idolatry.

Some will have these Calves to have been set up in Imitation of Solomon's Cherubin, but this is fully confuted by the learned Visorius. If Jeroboam, saith he, by his Calves design'd to imitate the estab-<sup>vide Dr.</sup> lish'd Religion of his Country, I pray you when he took <sup>Spencer, p.</sup> these counterfeit Cherubs, why not also the Ark, the <sup>773.</sup> Propitiatory, the Seat of God, where the Divine Majesty appear'd most conspicuously in giving of Oracles, the Tabernacle and the Temple? Why if they were made only in imitation of the Cherubs, why did he not call them by their own Name, by which they were known to the People, when that would have been a more easie way to deceive them? Why did he not take the Priests of the Family of Aaron, why did  
ha

he banish them out of his Kingdom, why did not the People comply for three whole Years, if it had been an Imitation of their Old Religion under David and Solomon? Why if they were nothing but Cherubins, are they so often in Scripture styled other Gods? Why should he Sacrifice to them, when in the Law of Moses no Sacrifices were offered to the Cherubim?

So that it is plain that these Calves were set up by him as Idols or Symbols of a new or separate Religion from the Tribe of Judah; and tho he took up the old Egyptian Idol for his Foundation, yet he seem'd to have erected a Motley Religion upon it, like that of the Samaritans of old, partly to invite the People of all Nations into his Kingdom, where every Man worshiped his own God; and partly by diversity of Religion, more effectually to divide his own Kingdom from that of the Line of Solomon.

Tho not long after Rehoboam and the Tribe of Judah revolt from the Worship of the true God (as the Scripture aggravates it) *above all that their Fathers had done.*

1 King. 14.  
22.

And from this time Idolatry, or the Worship of Baal, was the prevailing Religion in both Kingdoms, tho sometimes check'd by the Piety of reforming Princes. But it spread so fast, that Elijah thought himself left alone, tho for his comfort God informed him, that he had the small remainder

mainder of 7000 in Israel, all the Knees which have not bowed unto Baal.

1 King. 19.  
14, 18.

But the Infection soon became universal, and tho God Almighty sent his Prophets from time to time to reclaim them, yet all in vain, they still continued to worship the Host of Heaven, and serve Baal, till finding them irreclaimable, he first delivered the Ten Tribes into the hands of Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, where they continue in Captivity to this Day, and are a lost Nation.

2 King. 17.

But the Piety of Hezekiah at that time for a while repriev'd the Tribe of Judah : But his Son Manasseh built up again the High Places, which Hezekiah his Father had destroyed, and he rear'd up Altars for Baal, and worshiped all the Host of Heaven, and served them : Upon this God by his Prophets denounces their Destruction. Because, saith he, they have ever done that which was evil in my sight, and have provoked me to Anger since the Day their Fathers came forth out of Egypt, unto this Day ; or because they have forsaken me, and burnt Incense unto other Gods, that they might provoke me to Anger with all the work of their Hands ; therefore my wrath shall be kindled against them, and shall not be quenched. But the Execution of the Sentence is suspended during the pious Reign of his Son Josiah ; but as soon as he is gathered to his Fathers, Jerusalem and the Temple are destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar,

Ver. 15.

Cap. 22. 17.

2 King. 25.

and

and King *Zedekiah* with all his People are carried Captive into *Babylon*.

This is a compendious History of the old Jewish Idolatry, and I think a sufficient Proof both of their strange Inclination to it, to the highest degree of Madness, and wherein it plainly consisted, their forsaking the *true invisible God*, to worship *created Deities*; than which nothing is more evident through the whole Series of Scripture.

To this Evidence I might add a more ample Proof out of the Writings of the Prophets, that are almost wholly imployed upon this Subject. But I must not be too tedious, and therefore I shall only observe, that they generally express the greatness of this Folly under the Figure of ungovernable Lust. Thus *Ezekiel* the 23<sup>d</sup>. God describes it to the Prophet under this Scheme. *Son of man, there were two Women, the Daughters of one Mother, and they committed Whoredoms in Egypt, they committed Whoredoms in their Youth; there were their Breasts pressed, and there they bruised the Teats of their Virginity; and the Names of them were Ahola the Elder, and Aholibah her Sister, and they were mine, and they bare Sons and Daughters; Samaria is Ahola, and Jerusalem Aholibah; and Ahola played the Harlot when she was mine, and she doted (or run mad) for her Lovers, the Assyrians her Neighbours, with all their Idols she defiled her self, neither*  
left



lest she her Whoredoms brought from Egypt; for in her Youth ('tis in the Hebrew) before she was ripe of Age, they lay with her, and they bruise'd the Breasts of her Virginity, and poured their Whoredom upon her; wherefore I have delivered her into the Hand of her Lovers, into the Hand of the Assyrians, upon whom she doted, and after whom she ran mad.

The same is repeated of her Sister *Abolibah*, who for her incorrigible Adulteries is delivered into the hands of the *Babylonians*; nothing can be expressed with greater vehemence than this, that is compared to the utmost lewdness of Female Lust; and nothing more evident, than that this Lewdness consisted in deserting the true invisible God, to worship the false Deities of their Neighbours, particularly the Gods of the *Egyptians*, *Assyrians* and *Chaldeans*.

And that is my Second Head of Discourse, that the Gods that they worshiped at that time were nothing but the Heavenly Bodies, or the Sun, as the Supreme Deity. This is evident enough from what hath already been discoursed, Idolatry in general being every where described in Scripture by the Worship of the Host of Heaven, or Heavenly Bodies. Thus Deut. 4. 19. Lest thou lift up thine Eyes to Heaven, and when thou seest the Sun and the Moon, and the Stars, even all the Host of Heaven, shouldst be driven (tempted) to worship them, which the Lord thy God created for the use and benefit  
O of

of all Nations under the whole Heaven. So Chap. 17. v. 2, 3. If there be found any among you that have wrought Wickedness in the sight of the Lord your God in transgressing his Covenant, and hath gone and served other Gods, and worshiped them, either the Sun, or Moon, or any of the Host of Heaven, ye shall stone him to Death, 2 King. 17. 16. They left all the Commandments of the Lord their God, and made them Molten Images, two Calves, and made a Grove, and worshiped all the Host of Heaven, and served Baal. So Manasseh erected Altars to Baal, and worshiped the Host of Heaven, chap. 21. 3. So Josiah, when he destroyed Idolatry, brought out the Vessels of the Host of Heaven.

And the Jews, when after their return from Captivity, they would enter their solemn Protestation against Idolatry, they do it in this form—Thou even Thou art Lord alone, thou hast made Heaven, the Heaven of Heavens, with all their Host, &c. Nehemiah 9. 6. So Jeremiah 17. 13. Jerusalem and Judah shall be destroyed because they have burned Incense unto all the Host of Heaven, and have poured out Drink Offerings unto other Gods. So Zephaniah 1. 5. God threatens to destroy the Worshipers of Baal, and of the Host of Heaven : And lastly, St. Stephen in his last Speech upbraiding the Jews with their Idolatry, says, that God gave them up to Worship the Host of Heaven.

So evident is the Practical Notion of Idolatry, through the whole Series of Scripture, that it was the worshipping the Heavenly Bodies as the supreme Deities, or as *Job* emphatically expresses it, *Chap. 31. ver. 26. If I beheld the Sun when it shin'd, or the Moon walking in brightness, and my Heart hath been secretly enticed, or my Mouth hath kissed my Hand, this also were an Iniquity to be punished by the Judge, for I should have denyed the most High God.*

What can be more plain than this Definition of Idolatry, that it is the Worship of the *Sun* and *Moon*, because it would have excluded the Worship due only to the most High God? And the very Word, that we commonly translate *Images* in general, signifies properly Images of the *Sun*. Thus *Leviticus 26. 30.* God threatens them *I will destroy your Images*, as we translate it; but in the Hebrew your *Chamanim*, i.e. Images of the *Sun*. So the second of *Chronicles*, chap. 34. v. 7. And so it is set sometimes in the Margent even in the English Translation [*or Sun Images*] as *Isaiah 17. 8. Ezek. 6. 4.*

And so all learned Men of all Nations, all Religions, ever understood the old Notion of Idolatry, till this last Age, when Folly and Passion cast it at any thing that peevish Men were angry with. So *Rabbi Maimon*, the most learned and judicious of the Jewish Doctors, discourses at large, that the antient Idolatry was nothing

*More Ne-  
voch. Lib.*

<sup>3.</sup>

but the Religion of the Eastern Nations, who acknowledge no other Deities but the Stars, among whom the Sun was supreme, in *Opposition* to which false Principle, he says, God enacted the *Law of Moses*.

This was the sense of all the other old Heathen Nations, as may be seen at large in *Eusebius's* Collections of their several Opinions in his First and Third Book of the *Preparation of the Gospel*, where he proves, that the antient Heathens worshiped only the Stars, without any Notion of *Heroes* and *Demons*. The same is attested by all the Historians; by *Diodorus Siculus* of the *Egyptians*, by *Herodotus* of the *Persians* and *Chaldeans*, by *Strabo* and *Justin* of the *Arabians*, by *Cæsar* of the *Germans*; so *Macrobius*, in his first Book *Saturnal*, proves it of all the antient Idolaters, that it was the Worship of the Sun as the supreme Deity. So in the antient Hymn to *Jupiter* ascribed to *Orpheus*, it is the Sun only that is all along adored.

In short, so all learned Men interpret all the several Idols that we read of in the Holy Scriptures; particularly those two learned Protestants, Mr. *Selden*, in his learned Book *De Diis Syris*; and *Gerard Vossius*, *de Idololatria*, proves all the Idols mentioned in Scripture to have been only so many several Appellations of the Sun, whom the antient Idolaters believ'd to have been the supreme God.

God and Creator of the World, as *Baal, Baal Peor, Bel, Moloch, Dagon, Baalzebub Mythras,* &c. In a Word, the whole Nation of the Critiques, that agree in nothing else, are unanimous here; tho indeed the thing is so evident in all the Accounts, Histories and Descriptions of the Antient Idolatry, that it is to me the greatest astonishment in the World, that Men should apply it to any other purpose.

I know there was another sort of *Idolatry* introduced afterward, the *Worship* of *Men* and *Women*, but I find no such Practice in the Scriptures, but take it to have been much more modern, and a meer Invention of the vain and lying *Greeks*; but whensoever it came in, it was grafted upon the old Stock, of giving the *Worship* of the supreme God, not only to *created*, but to *mortal Beings*.

Here it were easie to wander into a large Field of Mythologick Mystery; but besides that, I take all Mythology to be much more Fable than the literal Fable it self: I have resolv'd to confine my self to the Information of the Holy Scriptures, from whence, as we have the most infallible Testimony that can be had, so in this case we can have no other, all other Writings whatsoever being by some Thousands of Years too modern to give any Account from their own Knowledge of those Antient Times.

And

And for a more accurate account of this, I shall refer the Reader to that admirable Book of Dr. *Spencers*, concerning the Jewish Laws and the Reasons of them, in which he proves every Minute Circumstance of the ritual and ceremonial Law to have been enacted only for the prevention of *Idolatry* or *Sun-Worship*. There any Gentleman that delights in antient Learning, may have his glut of Pleasure and Satisfaction ; for beside the great Compass and Variety of polite Literature, he hath brought Wit, Sense, Reason and Ingenuity into the *Synagogue*. I will only exemplifie the thing in some few Particulars.

The first is the Institution of some Rites peculiar to God's own Worship, both as a Bar to preserve them from any other Worship, in which those Rites were not us'd, and as an Obligation to bind them the faster to their Duty to himself ; among these the chiefest are *Circumcision* and the *Sabbath*, which he instituted, as it were, the *two Sacraments* of the Jewish Religion, or the Worship of the Creator of Heaven and Earth, to distinguish them from their Neighbour Nations, who Worship only his Creatures.

With *Circumcision* God sign'd his Covenant with *Abraham*, which was the first Revelation of himself against *Idolatry*, and the Foundation of the whole *Mosaick* Law, which was seal'd to, by this sacred Rite of *Circumcision* ; so that with-



out it, they were esteemed no better than *Idolaters*, and an *uncircumcised Man* signifies no less than an *Heathen*.

This Reason is expressly given by God himself at the first Institution of it in his Covenant with *Abraham*: *I will establish my Covenant between thee and me, and thy Seed after thee in their Generations* Gen. 17. 7, 10. *for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto Thee, and to thy seed after thee. This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee, every Male Child among you shall be Circumcised. And you shall circumcise the Flesh of your Fore-skin, and it shall be a Token of the Covenant betwixt you and me; and therefore the uncircumcised shall be cut off from his People, as having broken my Covenant, i.e. renounced the true Religion, which is, as Grotius observes, not reasonably to be understood of Infants, but of Men grown to Years of Understanding, whose Parents had neglected that Office in their Infancy, and therefore if they did not supply that Defect, when they came to Age, it was looked upon as renouncing the Worship of the true God, of which this was the first Sacrament or Ceremony of Admission into the Jewish Church, which alone profess'd it, and that is the Reason of St. Paul's Assertion, Every Man that is circumcised,* Gal. 5. 3. *is a Debtor to do the whole Law, i.e. he that willingly and knowingly undergoes this initiating Ceremony, by Vertue of that he obliges himself to the*  
Ob-

Observation of the whole *Mosaick* Law, and all things commanded in it.

Exod. 12.  
48.

And for this Reason no Profelyte was admitted to the Paschal Festival, the most sacred Solemnity of the Jewish Religion, without Circumcision. *When a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Pasover to the Lord, let all his Males be circumcised, and then let him come near, and keep it, and he shall be as one that is born in the Land; for no uncircumcised Person shall eat thereof.*

1 Mac. 1.  
v. 15, 48, 60  
61.

This seems to be the meaning of that Passage, *Joshua* 5. 9. when God commanded *Joshua* to circumcise all the People, that were born in the Wilderness, and that indeed is all then living; for those that came out of *Egypt* were dead, and when *Joshua* had done it, *God* tells him, *This day have I rolled away the Reproach of Egypt from off you; the Reproach of Egypt was their Idolatry, which they had now renounced by the Sacrament of Circumcision.* And accordingly in the Persecution of *Antiochus Epiphanes* to abolish the Jewish Religion, and establish Idolatry, the Jews are commanded to leave their Children uncircumcis'd; and the Apostates endeavoured to blot out the Marks of their Circumcision; and certain Women that had taken care to circumcise their Children, were put to Death, and the Infants hanged about their Necks. That was the distinctive Mark through all Ages between a Worshiper of the true

true God and an Idolater. So that it was the same thing, not to be circumcised, and to apostatise to Idolatry.

The second, and indeed the greatest Bar of all against Idolatry, was the *Institution* of the *Sabbath* in memory of Gods Creation of the whole visible World, and for that reason this Doctrine of the *Sabbath*, was reputed as fundamental an Article in the Jewish Church, as the Doctrine of the *Cross* in the Christian, because all other Articles of their Religion depended upon the belief of their God's Creation of the World.

And therefore when God had given *Moses* a compleat Body of Laws for his own Worship, he ratifies, and as it were comprises them all in a vehement and reiterated pressing that one Law of the Sabbath, *Exod. 31. v. 12.* to the end of the Chapter. And after the Children of *Israel* had committed Idolatry in worshiping the Golden Calf, for which God had for some time cast them off, he is at last prevailed upon by *Moses* to renew his Covenant with them upon a new Contract. First, That they worship none of the *Gods* of the *Heathen Nations*, nor ever use any of their *Rites* and *Ceremonies*. And then that they be more careful to observe the *Pasover* and the *Sabbath*, *Exod. 34. 12.*

And the Observation of the Sabbath is again enforced in the very beginning of the next Chapter, as the Bond and Epitome of the whole Law, *And Moses gathered all the Congregation of the Children of Israel together, and said unto them, these are the words which the Lord hath commanded that ye should do them, Six days shall work be done, but on the Seventh day, there shall be to you a Holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord, whosoever doth work therein shall be put to death; As if the Sabbath alone were the whole Law, according to that Saying of the Talmud, Whosoever denies the Sabbath, denies the whole Law. Because that's an Acknowledgment of the Creator of the World, as the Author of the Mosaick Law. And for that reason the Almighty upon all occasions styles himself in Scripture, Creator of Heaven and Earth, which we (improperly enough) translate Possessor of Heaven and Earth; and indeed the History of the Creation it self, and the whole Pentateuch, seem to have been written on purpose to prevent Idolatry, or the Worship of Created Beings; and therefore Moses doth not set down the Creation of the Universe in gross, but of every part by it self, particularly of the Sun, Moon, and Stars. And that is in it self a sufficient Security against giving them that were meer Creatures, the Worship that is only due to the Creator.*

And this seems to be the reason of the particular form of words in the Fourth Commandment, *Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, for in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, and rested the seventh day*; As if he had said, be sure that you be particularly mindful of this Commandment of the Sabbath above all others, for it is a Day dedicated to the Eternal Memory of the Creation, and therefore enjoyn'd to be observ'd every Seventh Day, that it may continually bring to mind that great work, and never suffer it to decay out of thy Memory.

And from hence it is that the Precepts of not worshiping Idols, and observing the Sabbath, are so frequently coupled together in the Scriptures, as if they were inseparable. *Exod. 23. 12, 13. Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest, and make no mention of the Names of other Gods, neither let them be heard out of thy mouth. Levit. 19. 34. Ye shall keep my Sabbaths, I am Jehovah your God; turn ye not unto Idols, nor make to your selves molten Gods: I am the Lord your God. Levit. 26. 1, 2. Ye shall make ye no Idols, ye shall keep my Sabbaths. Ezek. 20. 18, 20. Walk ye not in the statutes of your Fathers, nor defile your selves with your Idols, and hollow my Sabbaths that are for a sign between you and me, that you may know that I am Jehovah your God; for their hearts went after their Idols: so v. 24. they polluted my Sabbaths.*

And as these Commands are so frequently joyned together, so is the violation of them, as if they could not be parted, *Ezek. 20. 16. They polluted my Sabbaths, and their eyes were after their Fathers Idols.* And King *Abaz*, when he set up Idolatry, he in Contempt turn'd the Covert for the Sabbath out of the House of the Lord. *1 Mac. 1. 44. And many of the People consented to the command of the King, and sacrificed to Idols, and prophaned the Sabbath.* So necessary was it for the observation of the Sabbath, and the Worship of the true God, to run the same Fate, or stand and fall together; because the Sabbath was instituted in memory of the Creation of the World by the true God; and therefore the belief and observation of it, was an open Defiance to all Idolatry, as the Psalmist joyns them together, *All the Gods of the Heathens are Idols: But the Lord made the Heavens.*

2 King. 16.  
18.

Psal. 96. 5.

Jer. 10. 11,  
12.

And this is the distinctive Character that God hath given between himself, the only true God, and the Heathen Idols or Vanities; *The Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth shall perish from the Earth, and from under the Heavens. The Lord hath made the Earth by his Power, he hath framed the Universe by his Wisdom, and hath stretched out the Heavens by his Discretion.*

Now the Observation of the Sabbath, as instituted in honour of the invisible Creator of the visible or material World, being the fundamental  
Article



Article of Faith in the Jewish Church, in opposition to Idolatry, or giving the Worship of the supreme Deity to created Beings, it is for that reason more frequently recited than any other Law, and its Breach as severely punished as Idolatry it self; the recital of this Command is almost half of the Law and the Prophets, and the violation of it certain Death, as a Crime of the same Nature with Idolatry it self. So evident is it through the whole Series of sacred History that the *Sabbath* was instituted in opposition to *Idolatry*, and that the Idolatry it was opposed to, was the *Worship of created Beings as the supreme uncreated Deity*.

To conclude this Argument, tho I designed to confine my self to the Testimony of Holy Scripture, that is the only competent Witness in the case; yet I find such a pregnant Passage cited out of St. Cyril of *Alexandria* to the same purpose with the Premises, from his own Observation of the Train of Scripture History, that it were great pity to rob the Reader of so fair an Authority, "*After the Israelites, (says he) left their* Hom. 6. de  
"*own Country to sojourn in Egypt, in process of time* fest. Pasch.  
"*they lost all memory of their Ancestors, and descent*  
"*from the Line of Abraham; so that their antient*  
"*Customs being worn out by degrees, and the Religion of*  
"*their Forefathers disus'd, they were at length debauch-*  
"*ed by conversation with the Egyptians to Idolatry, and*  
"*gave*

“ gave the worship of the supreme God to the Sun, and  
 “ under him to the Heavens, Earth, Moon, Stars.  
 “ And therefore when God delivered them out of their  
 “ Egyptian Bondage, to bring them to the promised  
 “ Land, he peremptorily commands them to discard all  
 “ their Egyptian Errors; but because there was need  
 “ of an evident sign, by which they should, as it were,  
 “ be forced to confess, that Heaven was made by his  
 “ Almighty Power; and that the Sun, Moon, and  
 “ Stars, and all other Beings, were the works of his  
 “ hands, he commands the Festival of the Sabbath  
 “ as a Memorial and Imitation of himself and his  
 “ work; and therefore they that devote themselves to  
 “ rest as their Creator rested, by that acknowledge, that  
 “ all other things were the product of his Power; and  
 “ that is the natural design of the Sabbath Rest, to af-  
 “ fect them with a sense of the supreme Deity, or Cre-  
 “ ator of all things.

In the second place, a very great and considera-  
 ble part of the *Mosaick* Law was enacted, purely  
 in opposition to the Old Heathen Rites and Cu-  
 stoms. Here I omit the Idolatry of the *Zabii*,  
 so much of late insisted upon by learned Men,  
 because I find no antient Footsteps of any such  
 People in the World.

The *Mahometan Arabic* Writers are the first that  
 make any mention of them, and their Divinity (as  
 the *Arabians* describe it) is a meer Fanatick Rhap-  
 sody of *Chaldaism*, or *Astrologick Idolatry*, *Judaism*,  
 or

or the History of the *Patriarchs* turned into *Fables*; *Gnosticism*, or the Worship of *Demons* and *Angels*; *Pythagorism*, or turning all things into *Allegories*, and therefore must be of a much younger Date than Christianity.

The first time we read of them, is in the *Alchoran*, and *Mahomet* gives them that name of *Zabii*, because they lay Eastward from *Arabia*, for so the Word signifies *Easterlings*: Or more probably from a Fanatick Imitation of the Old Testament, that frequently and commonly styles the Heathen Idolaters by the Title of *the men of the East*, i.e. the *Chaldeans*, who were situated Eastward of *Judea*.

After him we have no account of any such Nation as the *Zabii*, till about Eight Hundred Years since. For the Prophet and his barbarous Followers, as they conquered, destroyed all Monuments of Learning, till being settled in Peace and Empire, (as is the manner of all Barbarians) they betook themselves to the humour of Learning, and translated Books out of other Languages, not only *Greek* and *Latin*, but of their Neighbour Nations into their own Tongue.

This is the most antient Account, after all the noise that has been made of their extreme Antiquity, that we have of any *Zabian* Writers; so that setting that Modern Nation aside, the *Mosaick* Rites were instituted in opposition to the more  
antient

Lev. 18. 3.

ancient Idolatry of their Neighbour Nations, particularly the *Egyptians* and the *Canaanites*, of whom there was most danger by reason of their late conversation with the one, and their new conversation with the other. And therefore against these God arms them with a special Caution, *After the doings of the Land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt shall ye not do ; and after the doings of the Land of Canaan, whether I bring you, shall ye not do ; neither shall ye walk in their Ordinances.*

This contrariety of the Jews to the Laws and Customs of all other Nations is made use of by *Haman* to King *Ahasuerus* to procure their Destruction ; *Esther 3. 8.* And *Haman* said unto King *Ahasuerus*, there is a certain People scattered abroad, and dispersed among the People in all the Provinces of thy Kingdom, and their Laws are divers from all People, neither keep they the Kings Laws ; and therefore it is not for the King's Interest to suffer them. If it please the King, let it be written that they may be destroyed.

Hist. l. 5.

This is perpetually objected by *Manetho* the Egyptian Priest against the Jews, that they aimed at nothing so much in the Rites of their Religion, as to affront and reflect Defiance upon the Egyptian Devotion. And so *Tacitus* his account of them is this ; *Moses ut sibi in posterum Judæorum gentem firmaret, novos ritus contrariosque cæteris mortalibus indidit ; Prophana illis omnia, quæ apud nos sacra ; rursum concessa apud illos, quæ nobis incesta.* Moses, that

*that he might the better confirm the Jewish Nation to himself, instituted new Rites, contrary to the customs of the rest of Mankind ; what is most sacred with us, is most prophane with them ; and what with us is esteemed most abominable, is allowed to them as lawful and innocent.*

This is the certain ground of that known universal contempt and hatred of all other Nations against the Jews : And so that Passage in *Jeremiah*, cap. 12. ver. 9. is applyed by *Grotius* to the Jews, *Mine Heritage is unto me as a speckled Bird ; the Birds round about her are against her : Mine Inheritance is become like a strange Bird, and is pursued by all the Birds of the Field ;* As when a Bird of a strange Colour, happens to consort with other Birds, it is natural for them all to set upon it ; and this was the case of the Jews in reference to all their Neighbour Nations.

It were an endless work to recite all the Rites peculiar to the Jews, and instituted in contradiction to the Customs of their Neighbours, when it is the only reason that runs through almost all their Law, even to the boiling of a Kid or Lamb in its Dams Milk ; to the sowing of divers Seeds together ; plowing with an Ox and an Ass ; wearing Linsey Woolsey, &c. And therefore I shall only instance in two remarkable particulars.

The Institution of the Pasover ; And the Law against Sacrificing in High Places, both which are enjoy'd as most effectual Remedies against Idolatry.

Exod. 12. 3. The Pasover was the first Law instituted by God, at, or upon their Deliverance out of Egypt. *In the Tenth day of this Month, they shall take to them every Man a Lamb, a Male of the first Year, according to the House of their Fathers.* In the Observation of this great Solemnity, as it is there prescribed, every the most minute Circumstance is an express defiance to the Egyptian Follies. First, the Paschal Lamb must be a Male a year old, that is, a *young Ram* ; and that was the greatest Affront that could be put upon the *Egyptians*, that held a *Ram* not only in religious esteem, but the most Sacred of all their *Holy Animals* in more antient times, as the Symbol of the Sun entring the Sign *Aries*, and beginning the New Year : And afterwards of *Jupiter Ammon*, whom the *Greeks* planted upon the Stock of the Old Egyptian Idol of the Sun.

Now upon the account of the Sacredness of these Animals, they never offered any of their Species in Sacrifice. And hence when *Pharoah* bid *Moses* go Sacrifice to the Lord in the Land of Egypt, *Moses* answers, that they dare not, *Because it would be an Abomination to the Egyptians, so that they would stone them* ; that is, it would be a Prophaneness



phaneness and open Affront to the Religion of the *Egyptians* if they should offer in Sacrifice (according to the custom of their Fore-fathers) those very Animals that the *Egyptians* had consecrated to the Honour of their Gods. And for the same reason they are commanded to Sacrifice the Pasover with a young *Bullock*, as well as a young *Ram*, out of *Deut. 16. 2.* the Flock, or out of the Herd, as the Scripture expresses it. And when King *Josiah* kept, after a long intermission, a most solemn Passover, besides *2 Chron. 25.* Lambs and Kids, he gave to the People 3000<sup>7</sup> *Bullocks*.

Now next to a Ram the Bullock was the most Sacred of all the Holy Animals, and therefore made the second Sign in the *Zodiack*. And therefore when the *Greeks*, or later *Egyptians*, gave the first Symbol to *Jupiter Ammon*, their Supreme God, they gave the second to *Osyris*, by them commonly called *Apis* (not understanding that that word only signified the Image, not the Deity) so that here *Tacitus* his Malice is not much in the wrong; *Cæso Ariete velut in contumeliam Ammonis, Bos quoque immolatur, quem Egyptii Apim vocant. They sacrifice a Ram in Affront to Ammon, and a Bullock in Affront to Osyris.* Beside, it must be a Male, not a Female, because the *Egyptians* and Heathens (who indeed generally followed the Egyptian Customs, especially the *Greeks*) used only Females in their Sacrifices.

But the most observable circumstance in this whole Solemnity, is the time of its Celebration ;  
 Exod. 12. 36. the Lamb was to be solemnly set apart for the Sacrifice on the Tenth Day of the Month, till the Fourteenth, because on the Tenth Day, on which the Sun entred the Sign *Aries*, began the great Festival of *Aries*, or the New Year ; so that beginning the Jewish Pasover at the same time, it was a manifest Triumph over the Egyptian Deity, by cutting the Throat of the poor Beast, with as much Solemnity as the *Egyptians* at that very time worship'd it.

And for the same reason a Cow that was sacred to *Isis*, or rather to some more antient Deity, I  
 Num. 19. suppose the *Moon*, was commanded to be driven out of the Camp, and burnt as an unclean Beast ; and so because the *Egyptians* address'd their Worship to a Goat, as the Symbol of some Deity, probably the Sun in that Sign, God commanded the Jews to make use chiefly of Goats in their Expiatory Sacrifices, and particularly the Scape Goat, laden with all the Sins, and all the Curses of the People ; and hence the *Israelites* were strictly forbidden to Sacrifice to Goats, which  
 Levit. 17. 7. we translate Devils : *And they shall no more offer Sacrifice to Devils, ( τοῖς τεύχεσι ) to Goats, after whom they have gone a whoring. This shall be a Statute for ever unto them throughout their Generations.*

But

But to return to the Paschal Ram, all the circumstances of the Institution carry a remarkable significancy in them: Thus when they are commanded to besmear the Side-posts, and upper Door-posts or Lintel of every House: What could have been a more publick Contempt of the Egyptian Religion, when by it they declared, that the Almighty Power that had prov'd it self by so many Miracles and Judgments, especially this Last in the Death of the First-born, commanded to put all manner of contempt upon those Creatures that were consecrated to the Worship of their Gods, and to leave those Bloody Posts to the *Egyptians*, as Monuments of their baffled Deities?

And tho I have no Reverence to the Authority of the Jewish Rabbies in the account of antient times, being not only very trifling, but very modern Writers; yet there is cited an excellent Passage out of *R. Abraham Seba*, that I cannot omit to recite, not for its Authors sake, but its own. "*The Egyptians began the computation of their Months from the time that the Sun entred Aries; and this whole Month was celebrated with extraordinary Festival Solemnity, and was more sacred than all the Months of the year beside. God therefore designing to set his People at as great a distance as could be from the Customs of the Heathens, commanded them to begin the year, not from the Full Moon*"

“ Moon, as the Egyptians did, but from the first day  
 “ of the Month ; and whereas the Egyptians spared  
 “ their Cattle, and durst not so much as eat  
 “ Rams Flesh, therefore they are commanded to kill,  
 “ roast, and eat it ; so that whereas they offer Incense  
 “ to it, and perform their Solemn Devotions before it,  
 “ these are commanded in contempt to sprinkle the Blood  
 “ of this most Holy Animal upon the very Threshold  
 “ of their Houses. So far the Doctor.

So again they are commanded not to eat the  
 Paschal Ram raw, in opposition to the Customs  
 of the antient and barbarous Heathen Nations,  
 who eat all their Sacrifices raw, especially at their  
 signing of Covenants and Treaties of Peace ;  
 and that is the original Reason of the Command  
 to abstain from Blood.

Then it is to be eaten in *one House*, not to be  
 eaten abroad in solemn Pomp and Procession, as  
 the Heathen Priests did their raw Sacrifices. Nor  
*a Bone of it to be broken*, because the Heathen Priests  
 in their pretended holy Rage were wont to tear  
 their Sacrifices in pieces with their Teeth. The  
*Head with the Legs and Purtenance to be eaten*, because  
 the Heathens only eat the *Viscera*, or Inwards, *nothing*  
*of it to remain till the morning*, lest it should  
 be abus'd to superstitious uses, as the Heathens  
 did the Relicks of their Sacrifices, who sold them  
 to the People as a Charm against Diseases and ill  
 Luck.

All which circumstances are most particularly remarkable in the *Bacchanalia*, or great Festival of *Bacchus*, that the *Greeks* stole out of *Egypt*, as well as all their other Superstitions, as the most learned of them confess: And concerning the *Bacchanalia* in particular, *Herodotus* tells us by whom they were first brought out of *Egypt* into *Greece*, viz. the famous Phylitian *Melampus*.

Lastly, the *Pasover* was not to be sodden in *Water*, because the *Egyptians* and *Syrians* always boil their Sacrifices, especially to *Horus* or the *Sun*; and for that reason it is, that this little circumstance is so often urged, and so strictly observ'd. And this is particularly objected by *Manetho* the *Egyptian* against the *Jews*, that they were not content only to destroy their *iesi* *ῥῶα*, their *Consecrated Animals*, but consumed them by *Fire*, as it were burning their *Gods* in *Effigie*.

These are the great Reasons, why the Divine Law-giver laid so much stress upon this Solemnity, and all the circumstances belonging to it, when it was the grand Diagnostick, or distinguishing Character between the Worshipers of the true God, and of created Deities.

And therefore upon all Apostasies of the People from their Religion, it was the Custom of their pious Princes to recall them, by reviewing and renewing the Laws of the Paschal Festival. So *Josiah*, when he set himself to abolish all Relicks of Idolatry,

Idolatry, and establish the Worship of the true God for ever: *He commanded all the People, saying; Keep the Pasover unto the Lord your God; as it is written in the Book of the Covenant. Surely there was not holden such a Pasover from the days of the Judges that Judged Israel, nor of the Kings of Judea.*

That was an undeniable Proof of their complete Reformation.

2. The second Law enjoyn'd in opposition to Egyptian Idolatry, is that against sacrificing upon High Places, which were Egyptian Altars built in the form of High Towers, that they might make nearer approaches to the *Sun* in their Devotions. And therefore God, on the contrary, commands the *Israelites* to sacrifice to himself upon a low Altar of Earth, *Exod. 20. 24, 26.* without steps or stairs; which Laws were given either with, or immediately after the Ten Commandments, as it seems of equal weight with them.

So that to offer Sacrifices upon High Places, is always represented in Scripture as a very high Act of Idolatry; and to destroy the High Places in Scripture as an eminent Act of Reformation, which must be understood of Towers, not of Mountains, that are not so easily demolished. So *Levit. 26. 30. I will destroy your High Places, and cut down your Images, [or Chamanim] and cast your Carcases upon the Carcases of your Idols, and my Soul shall abhor you.* So *Numbers 22. 41.*

Balak



Balack took Balaam and brought him up into the High Places, or Pillars, as the Septuagint always render it by *σῦλα*, of Baal, that thence he might see the utmost part of the People. So Numb. 33. 52. *Ye shall drive out all the Inhabitants of the Land before you, destroy all their Pictures and Molten Images, and pluck down all their High Places.*

In the Historical and Prophetick Writings, *Idolatry* is almost every where exprest by *Sacrificing or Worshipping in High Places*. The Idol Priests are styled *Priests of the High Places*.

This, says *Herodotus*, was the received Custom of the antient Nations, and of this Nature were the Egyptian Pyramids; and that which is still standing is built in the form of an Altar, *i.e.* a four square Plane, ten Cubits broad on every side, (not as it is vulgarly suppos'd, a Point or Spire) to which the Priest advanced by 250 Ascents, which *Herodotus*, that viewed them above 2000 years ago, says, were so many lesser Altars. But that the Pyramids were supposed in the more polite Times, to have been antient Altars, is evident from that known Verse of *Lucan*.

*Votaque Pyramidum celsas solvuntur ad Aras.*

There are Monuments of this antient Custom still remaining in the *West Indies*. Gage in his Survey, describes such a Tower in the middle of the

R

great

great Temple at *Mexico*, of an 180 Ascents, where their Priests offered all their Sacrifices.

In short, the People of *Israel* were so fond of these High Altars, that some Princes, who would have demolisht them as pieces of Idolatry, were forced to persist for fear of popular Tumults and Seditions. So *Asha* in his Reformation, when he burnt their Idols, could not remove their High Places. So *Jeboash* could do every thing, but remove the High Places. So *Amaziah* was forced to leave them behind him: so his Son *Azariah*: and when they were demolished by *Hezekiah*, and some of the more pious Princes, they were ever first restored at the Peoples return to *Idolatry*.

1 King. 15.  
14.  
1 King. 22.  
43.  
2 King. 12.  
3.  
Chap. 14. 4.  
Chap. 15. 4.

And agreeable to what is here represented is the Reason annexed to the Divine Law, *lest ye discover your nakedness*; which words, tho they may be literally taken, yet according to the Language of Scripture in this matter, they have a much higher meaning, *i.e.* lest you commit *Idolatry* or Adultery with other Gods, and expose your shame and nakedness by playing the Harlot upon your High Places: These two things, *Idolatry* and Adultery being so frequently joyned together in Scripture, as the same Crime.

Thus far, to mention no more, it pleased God to provide against *Idolatry*, by enacting special Laws in direct Opposition to the Heathen Rites.

When

When God had casher'd the more rank and notorious Acts of Heathen Worship, he retained some of their more innocent Rites, especially those that were derived from the antient Patriarchs, before the later Corruptions were crept in, lest if God had given a Law altogether new, and abolished all their Old Customs, People that are always fond of the Usages of their Fore-fathers, should rather have revolted to the Heathen Idolatry, than submit themselves to such a new and uncouth Religion; and therefore out of condescension to their rudeness and weakness, God permitted them to retain several of their former Rites and Ceremonies in his new Worship, that by that Indulgence he might win them more easily to embrace his new Institution.

And this seems to be the *Grammatical* Sense of St. Paul's Expression, *That God suffered their Manners in the Wilderiness Forty Years*, where the word *παρατρέφει* *suffered*, is taken from the Use or Language of Mothers or Nurses, that are forced to humour and comply with the little Follies of their Children by any way to please them. Act. 13. 18.

In allusion to this word, God was pleased to expresse his Treatment of the Children of *Israel*, who knowing the weakness of their rude and childish Understandings, permitted and indulged them to enjoy not a few of their former Conceits together with his own Divine Law.

And so *Moses* lets them know in his Farewel  
 Deut. 1. 31. Speech, *That the Lord had all along born with them, as a  
 Father doth with his Child.* And so *Grotius* para-  
 phrases that passage of *St. Paul*, *When we were  
 Gal. 4. 3. Children, we were in Bondage under the Elements of  
 the World,* i. e. says he, we were under subjection  
 to those Rites and Usages that were common to  
 us with the rest of the World, as *Temples, Altars,  
 Sacrifices, New Moons,* to which he might have  
 added, *Oblations of First Fruits, Purifications, Fe-  
 stival Solemnities, Tabernacles, Dedication of Tents,  
 the Ark, the Cherubim or Teraphim* (for they are  
 promiscuously used in Scripture, and are of ve-  
 ry antient use:) These, and the like old Customs  
 were enjoyned the People of *Israel*, lest for want  
 of them they should relapse to *Idolatry*.

And because these Customs were common to  
 the Jews with the rest of the World, therefore  
 they are call'd the Elements of the World, and weak  
 and beggarly Elements, and carnal Ordinances,  
 that were impos'd and born with till the time of  
 Reformation, in the Apostolical Writings, when  
 they would beat down the value of the *Mosaic*  
*Law*.

But to omit the rest, I shall only insist upon the  
 Cherubim, that God commanded to be placed over  
 Exod. 25. the Ark, and all Divine Worship to be directed  
 .18 towards them, *And thou shalt make two Cherubims  
 of Gold, of beaten work shalt thou make them, in the  
 two ends of the Mercy seat, &c.* That

That they were Statues or Images is out of doubt by their Description, but of what particular Form is matter of Controversie among learned Men ; tho what ever they were, I am not concerned ; it is enough that they were Images used in the Worship of God, and then the use of Images is not in it self *Idolatry*.

That the Word originally and properly signifies an Ox, is evident from *Ezekiel*, who uses the Words promiscuously, *Chap. 1. 10.* As for the likeness of their Faces, *They four had the Face of a Man, and the face of a Lyon on the Right side, and they four had the face of an Ox on the left side, they four also had the face of an Eagle :* but *Chap. 10. 14* the same things are thus described, *And every one had four faces ; the first Face was the face of a Cherub, the second the face of a Man, the third of a Lyon, and the fourth of an Eagle* And as an Ox or a Cherub was used by the Antients as a Symbol of Strength or Power, so thence came they to signifie the thing it self ; so God tells the King of *Tyre*, that he was *his anointed Cherub*, i. e. that he had made him great and powerful. Ezek. 28.  
14.

Hence whenever God in Scripture is said to sit upon, or dwell between the *Cherubims*, it is when his *Power* particularly is represented. Thus when the *Israelites* were defeated by the *Philistins*, they agree at a Council of War to send for the Ark of God to save them out of the hands of their

<sup>1 Sam. 4. 3.</sup> their Enemies. *So the People sent to Shiloh, that they might bring from thence the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord of Hosts, who dwelleth between the Cherubims.* So King Hezekiah in his Distress calling upon the Divine Protection and Deliverance from his Enemy; *And Hezekiah prayed before the Lord, and said, O Lord God of Israel, that dwellest between the Cherubims, thou alone art God of all the Kingdoms of the Earth.* So *Psal. 99. 1. The Lord reigneth, let the People tremble; he sitteth between the Cherubims, let the Earth be moved.*

And for this reason were these sacred Images placed over the Ark, as the Symbols or Hieroglyphicks, to represent the Presence of the Divine Majesty; so that as the *Ark* is styled God's *Footstool*, the *Cherubims* are called his *Throne*: And so when the Ark and Cherubims were brought into the Temple, this Anthem was sung: *Lift up your Heads, O ye Gates, and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting Doors, and the King of Glory shall come in: Who is this King of Glory? the Lord of Hosts, the Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in Battle.*

In short, these Images were the most sacred things in all the Jewish Religion; what they were, I will not determine; some will have them to have been Statues of Beautiful Youths (as they are now vulgarly represented :) Others, the Statue of a young Bullock, from the synonymous signification of the Words: But the \*most learned

\*Grotius.

Dr. Spencer.  
Villalpandus  
Bochartus.

con.



conclude them, as they suppose with good Authority from the Scriptures, not to have been any one certain Form, but mixt of several Forms, in which that of a Bullock had the biggest share; but compounded of these four shapes, a Man's Face, an Eagles Wings, a Lyons Back, an Oxes or BULLOCKS Thighs and Feet. As they are described in the fore cited Chapters of *Ezekiel*, 1. & 10. And to this no doubt St. *John* alludes in his Vision of the Four Beasts, *Rev.* 4. 6, 7. *Round about the Throne were four Beasts; and the first Beast was like a Lion, and the second like a Calf, and the third had a face as a Man, and the fourth was like a flying Eagle. And they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.*

In Allusion, 'tis no doubt, to the representation of the immediate Divine Presence in the Ark by the Cherubims, that were made up of these four Beasts, that were probably pitcht upon, because of that great preheminance that they hold above all other Orders of Creatures. A Man for Understanding, an Eagle for Swiftnes, a Lyon and a Bull for Strength.

But what ever they were, they were sacred, Images set up by God himself in the place of his own Worship; and he was so far from forbidding the use of Images in it, that he would not be worshipped without them.

This

This is the true Account of *Idolatry*, as it is stated in the Scripture from the grand Design of the *Mosaick Law*, to restore the Worship of the true invisible God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, in opposition to the Idols, or created Deities of the Heathen World, and by all wise Arts and Methods to keep them loyal to himself: And this gives us the true *Rationale* of the *Mosaick Law*, in which every particular Rite had some regard to *Idolatry*. So that the Breach of any one ceremonial Law was a degree of it; and to boil a Kid in its Mothers Milk was *Idolatry*, as well as to offer Sacrifice to the *Sun*, because the Heathens used that form of Ceremony in the Worship of that God.

God did not think it sufficient for their security to forbid them the Worship of this false God, but every minute Circumstance that belonged to it, lest by degrees they might be reconciled to it. And therefore God calls himself upon all occasions a *jealous God*, and oftentimes a *jealous Husband*, to let them know, that they must not only avoid *Idolatry* it self, but all the least appearances and suspicions of it by Heathen Compliances.

Now if we compare this ancient *Idolatry* of the Jews, with that of late charged by some men upon

upon all Christians of the Roman Communion, I know not which will appear greatest, the Malice or the Folly of the Charge. It consists of these three Heads.

*I. The Worship of Images.*

*II. Adoration of the Host.*

*III. Invocation of Saints.*

All which are represented to the People as Crimes of the same Nature with the old Egyptian Idolatry.

But as to the first, the Use of Images in the Worship of God, I cannot but admire at the Confidence of these Men, to make so bold a Charge against them in general, when the Images of the Cherubim were commanded by God <sup>Exod. 25.</sup> himself.

They were the most solemn and sacred part of the Jewish Religion; and therefore, tho Images, so far from Idolatry, that God made them the Seat of his Presence, and from between them delivered his Oracles; so that something more is required to make *Idolatry*, than the *use of Images*.

This Instance is so plain and obvious to every Reader, there being nothing more remarkable

in all the old Testament, than the Honour done to the Cherubim, that 'tis a much greater Wonder to me, that those Men, who advance the Objection of Idolatry so groundlessly, can so slightly rid themselves of so pregnant a Proof against it.

Dr. St. of  
the Idolatry  
of the Church  
of Rome.

It is objected, I remember, by a learned Adversary, to the great Founder of this, and all other *Anticatholique*, and *Antichristian*, and uncharitable Principles among us; but he turns it off so carelessly, as if it were not worth his Notice. *First*, That they only directed their Worship towards the Images. Yea, they did so, as the Symbols of God's Presence, and that is to Worship God by *Images*, or to give the same Signs of Reverence to his *Representations*, as to *Himself*. And therefore when *David* exhorts the People to give Honour to the *Ark*, he says, *prostraverunt*, bow down to, or worship his *Footstool*, for *It*, or *He*, is *holy*.

And if so much outward Worship may be given to Images, as Symbols of the Divine presence, it is enough to justify it. But however the thing stands, the case of all Images is the same, and a Roman Catholique may make the same Plea for his Church, as this Author does for the Jews; and if he accept it in one Case, he cannot refuse it in another; or if he does, he will give but little proof of his Integrity.

At least God was not so nice and metaphysical in enacting his Laws, by distinguishing between bowing *to*, and *towards* ; or if these Gentlemen say, he was, they must shew us where : But what Authority do these Men assume to themselves, when by the precarious use of these two little Particles, they think to make the same Act the Whitest, and the Blackest thing in the World, *towards* an Image, 'tis innocent ; *to it*, Idolatry ?

But let them take which they please (for they are their own Carvers in all their own Controversies) If it be no Idolatry to Worship *towards* an Image, after all their Frights, they fairly give up the Cause to the Church of *Rome*, that requires no more.

But the second Reply is much more curious and metaphysical, That the Cherubims were not seen by the People, and adored but once a year by the High Priest : Here then we distinguish between the Idolatry of the *Sight* and the *Mind* ; an Image *seen* is *Idolatry*, but if *covered*, 'tis *none*. So that to adore the Host exposed, is *Idolatry* ; but in a Pix, 'tis *none*. What Rubbish is here to stuff out so weighty an Argument !

But if they did not *see* their Images in the Ark, they knew them to be there, and of what Form they were, being described to them by God himself in their Law. Upon these Terms it seems a

Blind Man can never be an Idolater ; and if all the Romanists would shut their Eyes at convenient Times, they would quit themselves of this black Acculation.

But the High Priest used this Solemnity only once a year. If it were *Idolatry*, it was as unlawful once a year, as if done every day ; and if lawfully done but once a year, it was no *Idolatry* : Its being seldom or frequent, makes no difference ; it is either always *Idolatry*, or it is never so.

And yet these little Pretences are the last Result of this great Argument ; and when we have loaded the greatest part of Christendom with the foulest Crime in the World, we think to make good the Acculation by such shameless Shifts and Pretences as these ; for in these Trifles, the Dispute, as to the Cherubim Images, ended ; and yet the Clamour of *Idolatry* is kept up as high as ever to this very day.

But what Images do the Roman Catholiques worship ? Do they worship any Image or Symbols of *False Gods*, as the *Supreme Deities* ? If they do not, then they are innocent of the worst part of *Idolatry*. Or do they attempt to make a *Similitude* of the true God, or *uncreated Divine Nature* ? That is the other part of *Idolatry*, and the Scripture knows no more ; therefore however superstitious they may be in their use of Images, yet they cannot



cannot be guilty of *Idolatry*, but upon one of these two Accounts, which no Man was ever yet so hardy as to charge upon that Church.

Till therefore it be proved that they worship Images of *false Gods* as the *Supreme Deities*, or that they worship the *true God* by *Corporeal Images* and *Representations* of his Divine Nature, there is no Footing for *Idolatry* in Christendom.

As for the Adoration of the Host, when they can prove 'tis given to it either as a *Symbol* of a *false God*, or the *Picture* of the *true one*, howsoever faulty it may be otherwise, it can be no *Idolatry*.

And as for the Invocation of Saints, unless they worship them as the *Supreme God*, the Charge of *Idolatry* is an idle Word, and the Adoration it self that is given to them as Saints, is a direct *Protestation against Idolatry*, because it supposes a *Superiour Deity*, and that Supposition cuts off the very being of *Idolatry*.

But to give an Account of their precarious Notions of *Idolatry*, and their more precarious ways of proving it, would swell to Volumes; and therefore at present I shall dismiss the Argument, and shall only observe what a Barbarous Thing it is to make the *Lives, Fortunes* and *Liberties* of the English *Nobility* and *Gentry* to depend upon such Trifles and Crudities, by remarking the unheard of and unparallel'd Penalties that are annexed to so slender a Law, viz. That

That every Offender shall be deemed and adjudged a Popish Recusant convict to all Intents and Purposes whatsoever, and shall forfeit and suffer as a Popish Recusant convict, and shall be disabled to hold any Office or Place of Trust or Profit, Civil or Military, in any of His Majesties Realms or Foreign Plantations; And shall be disabled from thenceforth to Sit or Vote in either House of Parliament, or make a Proxy in the House of Peers, or to sue, or use any Action, Bill, Complaint or Information in Course of Law; or to prosecute any Suit in any Court of Equity, or to be Guardian of any Child, or Executor or Administrator of any Person, or capable of any Legacy or Deed of Gift; and lastly, shall forfeit for every wilful Offence the Sum of Five Hundred Pounds.

Here are all the Punishments that can be inflicted upon a living Man.

Convict Recusancy it self, one would think, is Punishment more than enough for any one Crime:

35 Eliz.ca.

1.

*Abjuration of the Realm; Returning without leave, Felony without Clergy; upon refusing to abjure, Forfeiture of all Goods, Chattels and Lands for Life.*

3 Jacob.ca.

4.

*Forfeiture of Sixty Pounds per Annum, Banishment from the Kings Court under Forfeiture of an Hundred Pounds, and from London on the same Penalty*

*nalty, Forfeiture of Right of Patronage, Disabled from any Practice or Office in Law, and finally disabled to be Guardian, Executor or Administrator, and Legatee.*

This was thought the utmost Severity in the Zealous days of *Queen Elizabeth*; but alas! our Modern Zeal will not be confined to the gentle Moderation of our Fore-fathers; but now we must suffer all these, with many more, to the loss of our *Birth-rights*, and all *Benefits of Law*, for no higher Act of *Recusancy*, than not swearing to the Truth of *Dr. St's Unlearned and Fanatique Notion of Idolatry*; for that in reality is the bottom of all this Mischief and Madness.

And as it is advanced among us into so bloody a Charge; I cannot but declare my utter Abhorrence both of that, and its Abettors, as sworn Enemies to the Peace of Christendom; and in the Result of all, I find, *That Idolatry made the Plot, and that the Plot made Idolatry, and that the same Persons made both.*

Thus begging Allowance for Humane Infirmities, lesser Errors and Mistakes, which in so much variety of Argument and Citation will escape the greatest Care, I have declared my present Judgment of this unhappy Law, as I will answer for my Integrity to God and the World.